

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1932

CONTENTS

The Second Annual Meeting	2
The Bryan-Chamorro Treaty	3
REBECCA M. ANDERSON	
Notes on the History of Public Health in South Carolina, 1670-1800	13
ST. JULIEN RAVENEL CHILDS	
Samuel Slater, the Father of American Manufactures	23
D. H. GILPATRICK	
William Prynne, a Portrait	35
LAURA ELLEN HOWARD	
Some Observations of Travelers on South Carolina, 1800-1860	44
J. RION McKISSICK	
Members of the Association	52

CONSTITUTION

I

The name of this organization shall be The South Carolina Historical Association.

II

The objects of the Association shall be to promote historical studies in the State of South Carolina; to bring about a closer relationship among persons living in this State who are interested in history; and to encourage the preservation of historical records.

III

Any person approved by the executive committee may become a member by paying \$2.00, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of \$2.00.

IV

The officers shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary and treasurer who shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting. A list of nominations shall be presented by the executive committee, but nominations from the floor may be made. The officers shall have the duties and perform the functions customarily attached to their respective offices with such others as may from time to time be prescribed.

V

There shall be an executive committee made up of the officers and of two other members elected by ballot for a term of three years; at the first election, however, one shall be elected for two years. Vacancies shall be filled by election in the same manner at the annual meeting following their occurrence. Until such time they shall be filled by appointment by the president. The duties of the executive committee shall be to fix the date and place of the annual meeting, to attend to the publication of the proceedings of the Association, to prepare a program for the annual meetings, to prepare a list of nominations for the officers of the Association as provided in Article IV, and such other duties as may be from time to time assigned to them by the Association. There shall be such other committees as the president may appoint, or be instructed to appoint, by resolution of the Association.

VI

There shall be an annual meeting of the Association at the time and place appointed by the executive committee.

VII

The Association shall publish annually its proceedings to be known as *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*. It shall contain the constitution, by-laws, and minutes of the annual meeting together with such papers as may be selected by the executive committee. It is understood that all papers read at the annual meeting become the property of the Association except as otherwise may be provided by the executive committee.

VIII

This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present at the annual business meeting.

THE PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE SOUTH CAROLINA
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
1932

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

ROSSER H. TAYLOR - - - - - *President*
ALESTER G. HOLMES - - - - - *Vice-President*
ARNEY R. CHILDS - - - - - *Secretary and Treasurer*

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ROSSER H. TAYLOR - - - - - ARNEY R. CHILDS
ALESTER G. HOLMES - - - - - J. HAROLD EASTERBY
MARSHALL W. BROWN

J. HAROLD EASTERBY
Editor

The South Carolina Historical Association supplies *The Proceedings* to all its members; the Executive Committee elects the Editor. The price, to persons who are not members, is 50 cents per copy. Orders should be sent to Arney R. Childs, Logan School, Columbia, S. C.

Copyright, 1933
by
The South Carolina Historical Association

THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

The second annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association held in Greenville April 2, 1932, reached in every way the high standard set by the meeting of the previous year. There were over seventy persons in attendance at each of the sessions during the day and over fifty were served at the dinner session which closed the meeting.

The President, Professor R. L. Meriwether, opened the morning session with a brief expression of pleasure at the attendance and of appreciation for Furman University's welcome. The following papers were read: "The Bryan-Chamorro Treaty" by Miss Rebecca Anderson of Greenwood High School; "Notes on the History of Public Health in South Carolina, 1670-1800," by Professor St. Julian R. Childs of The Citadel; and "Samuel Slater, Father of American Manufactures," by Professor D. H. Gilpatrick of Furman University. The discussion of Miss Anderson's paper was led by Miss Ruth Boyd of Newberry High School, Professor Childs' paper was discussed by Professor A. G. Holmes of Clemson College, and Professor Gilpatrick's by Professor J. W. Patton of Converse College.

Miss Laura E. Howard, of Coker College, read at the afternoon session an interesting paper on "William Prynne", which was discussed by Professor C. M. Ferrell of the University of South Carolina. The business meeting followed. After the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Brown reported on the work of the Executive Committee for the year. Doctor Jones of Presbyterian College, Chairman of the Committee on the Preservation of Historical Material, told of the questionnaire sent to the libraries of the state asking the amount and type of South Caroliniana, how such collections were housed and to what extent they were available to students. The returns from the questionnaire were incomplete, but indicated that the committee had begun a valuable study. Professor Meriwether urged the members of the Association to help the committee in locating historical material and getting it into fire proof depositories. The nominees of the Executive Committee for the year 1932-33 were presented by Professor Brown and unanimously elected: President, Professor R. H. Taylor of Furman University; Vice-President, Professor A. G. Holmes of Clemson College, and Secretary-Treasurer, Mrs. Arney R. Childs of Columbia.

At the dinner session Professor J. Rion McKissick of the University of South Carolina read an entertaining paper on "Some Observations of Travelers on South Carolina, 1800-1860." The formal discussion led by Mr. E. T. H. Shaffer of Walterboro was followed by much pleasant informal discussion.

A. R. C.

THE BRYAN-CHAMORRO TREATY

REBECCA M. ANDERSON

Greenwood High School

Nicaragua, the largest of the five Central American republics, has for a long time attracted the interest of the United States and other powers because of its possession of a potential interoceanic canal route. The importance of this route has been so well recognized that, prior to 1909, the United States, Great Britain, and Japan had attempted to negotiate canal treaties with Nicaragua.¹

The negotiations which led to the Bryan-Chamorro treaty began in December 1912, when Nicaragua offered to the United States an option on a canal route.² The Conservative government of Nicaragua with which the United States dealt was the product of two revolutions. The revolt of 1909 was apparently approved and encouraged by the United States, the new government being recognized immediately.³ The new administration was unpopular however, since, as the United States Minister reported, the Conservatives were a minority party kept in power only by the moral support of the United States and the belief that actual support would be given if necessary.⁴ The revolt in 1912 was begun by a split in the Conservative party and received the support of anti-United States Liberals all over the country.⁵ With the help of some 2000 marines from the United States the revolutionists were finally defeated.⁶ When the marines were recalled a legation guard of 100 men was left at Managua. In the election which followed the Liberals refused to participate and Adolfo Díaz was made president. General Emiliano Chamorro, popular military leader of the Conservatives, was given the post of Minister to the United States.⁷

Supervision by the United States of the financial affairs of Nicaragua accompanied the political and military intervention. A large, long-term loan was desired which could be used to pay claims against the government, to reform and stabilize the inflated currency, and to consolidate the public debt. The United States Senate refused to

¹ G. T. Weitzel, "American Policy in Nicaragua," Senate Document 334, 64th Cong., 1st Sess., Vol. 42, p. 9.

² *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1913, p. 1021 (Hereafter cited *For. Rel.*).

³ President of Nicaragua to President Taft, June 3, 1910. *For. Rel.*, 1910, pp. 751-752.

⁴ American Minister to Nicaragua (Hereafter abbreviated: Amer. Min. to Sec. of State). *For. Rel.*, 1911, p. 656.

⁵ For an account of this revolution see *For. Rel.*, 1912, pp. 1027-1063.

⁶ "American Blood Spilt in Nicaragua" (editorial). *Literary Digest*, XLV (October 19, 1912), 658.

⁷ Amer. Min. to Sec. of State, November 5, 1912. *Ibid.*, pp. 1063-1064.

ratify the Knox-Costrillo Convention which would have provided for such a loan,⁸ but the Department of State gave its qualified approval to such small short-term loans as the New York bankers, Brown Brothers and Company and J. and W. Seligman and Company, were willing to risk.⁹ These loans, amounting in all before 1914 to around \$5,000,000.00,¹⁰ were made fairly safe by the appointment in 1912, upon recommendation of the United States Secretary of State, of Colonel Clifford D. Ham as Collector-General of customs.¹¹ Though reform of the currency was begun¹² and a mixed claims commission established¹³ these short-term loans required all available revenues and the financial situation of Nicaragua could improve but slowly.

It is true that in 1913 commerce and customs receipts were greater than ever before and inefficiency and dishonesty in the customs service were greatly reduced under the supervision of Colonel Ham. All hope for further improvement however was destroyed by the European war. Customs receipts dropped from \$1,730,603.00 in 1913 to \$789,716.00 in 1915.¹⁴ In October, 1914, there was a shortage of about \$50,000.00 monthly in running expenses of the government.¹⁵ Naturally, Nicaragua was desperately anxious to obtain cash by the sale of the Canal route. Meanwhile extensions of time for payments to the United States bankers and to European bondholders were obtained, Nicaragua promising to make overdue payments of interest and principal from the fund from the Canal Treaty.¹⁶

In December, 1912, Nicaragua offered the United States a thirty-year option on a canal route, the grant of a naval station on the Gulf of Fonseca on the Pacific coast and the lease of the Corn Islands in the Caribbean. In return the United States was to pay \$3,000,000.00 for the option "and an additional sum to be agreed upon, together with an annual rent charge, at the time of the exercise of the option."¹⁷ Mr. Weitzel, Minister of the United States to Nicaragua, stated that the treaty provided for growth in coastwise commerce and eliminated the possibility of further attempts by foreign powers to

⁸ For text of convention see *For. Rel.*, 1912, pp. 1074-1075.

⁹ I. J. Cox, *Nicaragua and the United States* (1927), pp. 715-716; *For. Rel.*, 1913, p. 1057.

¹⁰ *For. Rel.*, 1912, pp. 1078-1080; *For. Rel.*, 1913, p. 1043; J. P. Young, *Central American Currency and Finance* (1925), p. 166.

¹¹ Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 714.

¹² Young, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-168.

¹³ *For. Rel.*, 1913, p. 1042.

¹⁴ D. G. Munro, *The Five Republics of Central America* (1918), p. 148.

¹⁵ Amer. Min. to Sec. of State, Oct. 2, 1914. *For. Rel.*, 1914, p. 949.

¹⁶ Brown Bros. & Co. and J. & W. Seligman & Co. to Sec. of State, July 17, 1916. *For. Rel.*, 1916, pp. 902-906.

¹⁷ *For. Rel.*, 1913, p. 1021.

gain a canal concession.¹⁸ This "Weitzel-Chamorro Treaty," negotiated and signed during the last few weeks of the Republican administration at Washington, was killed in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by Senator Borah, who, with the Democrats on the committee, voted against it.¹⁹

During the year 1913, however, the Democratic administration became convinced of the desirability of the treaty.²⁰ Withdrawal from Nicaraguan affairs seemed impossible without sacrifice of the good already accomplished. There was danger that Nicaragua might obtain a new loan from Europe, thus making intervention by a European government a dangerous possibility. Furthermore, unless the awards of the Claims Commission and arrears in salaries of government employees were paid, the discontent of the people might cause another revolution with disastrous effect to the country and to the interests of foreign investors. The least objectionable form for assistance seemed to be the purchase of the interoceanic canal route.

Early in 1914, at the request of President Díaz, provisions were added to the prospective treaty which would have given Nicaragua the status of Cuba under the Platt Amendment.²¹ Although none of these provisions was included in the treaty in its final form because of opposition in the United States Senate, reports of this protectorate feature increased the opposition which had already developed throughout Central America and in the United States.

As early as April, 1913, Costa Rica had made formal protest against the earlier Weitzel-Chamorro treaty,²² saying that by a boundary treaty of 1858 Nicaragua had agreed to make no arrangement for canalization without consulting Costa Rica. If, however, the "natural rights" of Costa Rica were not injured by the transaction its opinion was to be advisory only. President Cleveland in an arbitral award in 1888 declared this treaty valid and stated that the "natural rights" of Costa Rica would be impaired if its territory were occupied or flooded, its rights to navigate the San Juan River impaired, or its rights in the harbors of San Juan del Norte and Salinas Bay encroached upon.²³

Nicaragua maintained that the convention was not "a final canal treaty" but "only an option," and that therefore it was not necessary

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Congressional Record*, 63rd Cong., 2nd Sess., Vol. 51, p. 11617.

²⁰ For appeals of Nicaraguan officials and statement of the case by the Latin American Division of the Department of State, see *For. Rel.*, 1913, pp. 1040-1045.

²¹ Min. of Nicaragua to Sec. of State, Feb. 12, 1914. *For. Rel.*, 1914, p. 953; *New York Times*, June 14, 1914, pt. II, p. 6.

²² Min. of Costa Rica to Sec. of State, April 17, 1913. *For. Rel.*, 1913, pp. 1022-1023.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 1023.

to ask the opinion of Costa Rica.²⁴ The United States responded that in 1900 Nicaragua and Costa Rica had in separate protocols agreed "to enter into negotiations with the United States" in regard to an interoceanic canal route.²⁵ Costa Rica denied this, stating that the protocol of 1900 had never been ratified by its government.²⁶

Further opposition developed in Salvador. That state declared that Nicaragua had no right to lease a naval base on the Gulf of Fonseca without the consent of the people of Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua, the three states bordering its waters. Salvador claimed that since the dissolution of the Republic of Central America the three states had remained joint owners of the Gulf.²⁷ The United States denied that the waters of the Gulf were held in joint ownership.²⁸ This denial was confirmed by the Government of Nicaragua which pointed to a protocol of 1900 between Nicaragua and Honduras in which the boundary line between those states was extended "to the middle point of the Bay of Fonseca."²⁹

Meanwhile in Washington the canal question was receiving attention.³⁰ Though not yet formally signed, the proposed convention was being considered by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and on June 19, 1914, Secretary Bryan and Charles A. Douglas, legal representative of Nicaragua, appeared before it to urge a favorable report.³¹ Senator Borah, a member of the Committee, refused to attend any of the hearings, stating that since the time when he had voted against the Weitzel-Chamorro treaty two years before, he had made a special study of the question which had confirmed his adverse opinion, and he wished to publish his facts and still not be accused of violating his honor as a committeeman. He added that "so long as there are called before that committee the mere puppets whom we have set up in that Government—you will not get the true facts."³²

The evidence brought out in the investigation which most injured the treaty prospects was that which revealed huge issues of paper money by the Conservative group. It appeared that 21,000,000 *pesos*

²⁴ Min. of Nicaragua to Sec. of State, June 5, 1913. *Ibid.*

²⁵ Sec. of State to Min. of Costa Rica, August 1, 1914. *For. Rel.*, 1914, pp. 964-965.

²⁶ Min. of Costa Rica to Sec. of State, June 20, 1916. *For. Rel.*, 1916, p. 846.

²⁷ Min. of Salvador to Sec. of State, October 21, 1913. *For. Rel.*, 1913, pp. 1027-1031.

²⁸ Sec. of State to Min. of Salvador, February 18, 1914. *For. Rel.*, 1914, pp. 954-956.

²⁹ Inclosure in letter of Min. of Nicaragua to Sec. of State, May 25, 1914. *For. Rel.*, 1914, p. 959.

³⁰ Discussion of the prolonged debate in the Senate on this question has been omitted for lack of space. See *Congressional Record*, 63rd Cong., 2nd Sess., Vol. 51, pp. 10514-11617 *passim*.

³¹ *New York Times*, June 19, 1914, p. 14.

³² *Congressional Record*, 63rd Cong., 2nd Sess., Vol. 51, p. 11617.

had gone to friends and partisans of Díaz.³³ Mr. Walter Bundy Cole, Manager of the National Bank of Nicaragua, when appearing before the committee, was asked how long he thought the Nicaraguan Government would last if the legation guard was withdrawn. He said, "Just long enough to catch the last car of the first train out of the capital."³⁴ The claims of Salvador and Costa Rica seem to have received little consideration by the Senate Committee. Secretary Bryan had suggested paying Costa Rica an indemnity for its claims to the San Juan River and it was evidently thought that this would suffice.³⁵

The treaty was signed August 5, 1914. The Government of Nicaragua granted "in perpetuity" to the United States "the exclusive . . . rights . . . for the construction (and) operation . . . of an interoceanic canal by way of the San Juan River . . . or . . . any route over Nicaraguan territory." It was stipulated that the details of terms upon which the canal should be constructed and operated would be agreed upon by the two governments whenever the United States should decide to build. The Government of Nicaragua also leased to the United States for ninety-nine years Great Corn Island and Little Corn Island in the Caribbean Sea and the right to establish a naval base anywhere on Nicaraguan territory that bordered on the Gulf of Fonseca, with the option of renewing the leases. In return the United States agreed to pay \$3,000,000.00 "to be applied by Nicaragua upon its indebtedness or other public purposes . . . in a manner to be determined by the two High Contracting Parties."³⁶

The administration at Washington, anxious because of financial conditions in Nicaragua to secure immediate action on the treaty, submitted it to the Senate on August 8th.³⁷ Opponents of the treaty, however, were able to prevent discussion of it by refusing to withdraw the point of no quorum.³⁸ Finally through administration pressure, the Foreign Relations Committee made its favorable report over a year later, in February, 1916.³⁹ Three days before the final vote was taken in the Senate an article appeared in the *New York Times* under the headline: "Germany Bids High on Nicaraguan Route." The article continued: "Members of the Foreign Relations Committee denied reports that there was any documentary evidence

³³ *New York Times*, June 26, 1914, p. 9.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, July 15, 1914, p. 3.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, June 24, 1914, p. 12.

³⁶ For text of treaty see *For. Rel.*, 1916, pp. 850-851.

³⁷ *Congressional Record*, 64th Cong., 1st Sess., Vol. 53, p. 13475.

³⁸ Sec. of State to Amer. Min., October 1, 1914. *For. Rel.*, 1914, p. 948.

³⁹ *New York Times*, January 27, 1916, p. 5; *ibid.*, February 3, 1916, p. 12.

in possession of the committee on the subject."⁴⁰ Possibly this report was based on the testimony of General Chamorro before the Foreign Relations Committee nearly two years before, when he said that Germany would pay more than \$3,000,000.00 for the route.⁴¹ The appearance of the statement at this time may have had great influence, since Germany now appeared particularly formidable.

On February 6th, the Senate after long debate in secret session ratified the treaty by a vote of 55 to 18. Voting for it were 40 Democrats and 15 Republicans; opposing it were 5 Democrats and 13 Republicans. Most of the Republicans supporting the treaty were conservative members from New England. They "took the view that the treaty was but a logical continuation of the Republican policy of dollar diplomacy."⁴² The Senate, in ratifying the treaty, added a proviso which declared "that nothing in said Convention is intended to affect any existing right" of Costa Rica, Salvador, or Honduras.⁴³

Soon after the Senate's ratification Costa Rica, having made one more ineffective protest to the United States,⁴⁴ turned to the Central American Court of Justice, which had been established at the conference of Central American nations held at Washington in 1907. Delegates from the United States and Mexico had sponsored the conventions then signed and were considered morally bound to respect and uphold them. The Court was composed of one judge from each of the five republics. It was given the right to determine its own jurisdiction which in general extended to all controversies among the five republics which could not be settled through the Departments of Foreign Affairs.⁴⁵ On May 1, 1916, the case was admitted to the Court by a vote of four to one.⁴⁶ The magistrate for Nicaragua dissented on the ground that the Court did not have jurisdiction since the parties had not attempted to come to an agreement through diplomatic channels.⁴⁷ Costa Rica claimed that its rights had been violated because it had not been consulted as provided for in the treaty of 1858, and that its consent was necessary "to perfect the compact" because of the possible interference with its free navigation of the San Juan River, and its joint ownership in two harbors. Also, that government contended, no reservation had been made by Nicaragua in favor of other Central American ships and in a treaty

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, February 15, 1916, p. 4.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, June 24, 1914, p. 12.

⁴² *Ibid.*, February 19, 1916, p. 1.

⁴³ *For. Rel.*, 1916, p. 851.

⁴⁴ Min. of Costa Rica to Sec. of State, February 2, 1916. *For. Rel.*, 1916, p. 811.

⁴⁵ See convention establishing the Court, *For. Rel.*, 1907, pp. 697-701.

⁴⁶ Amer. Min. to Sec. of State, May 4, 1916. *Ibid.*, p. 836.

⁴⁷ Costa Rica's formal protest in 1913 had been against the Weitzel-Chamorro negotiations which had superseded by the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty.

of 1907 the Central American countries had agreed that the merchant vessels of any country should be recognized as national vessels of each.⁴⁸ On September 30, 1916, the Court handed down its award declaring that Costa Rica's rights had been violated as charged. The final statement was: "As regards the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty being void this Court cannot make any declaration whatever."⁴⁹

About a month before this decision was announced Salvador had carried its complaint against Nicaragua to the Court,⁵⁰ charging: that the treaty endangered the security of Salvador, because the influence of the United States would be felt in the small states around the bay and in case of war between the United States and another power, that territory would become a battlefield; that the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty violated the rights of dominion of Salvador in the Gulf of Fonseca; that the treaty injured "the primary interests of Salvador,"⁵¹ because it diminished the chances of forming a Central American Union; and that the treaty was contrary to Article II of the General Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1907 in which the five states agreed not to alter their constitutions. Salvador asked that the Court compel Nicaragua "to abstain from fulfilling the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty."⁵² These charges were weakened somewhat by a letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Honduras, sent to the Government of Salvador September 30, 1916, in which he stated that Honduras did not recognize "any state of codomination with Salvador, nor with any other Republic, in the waters of Fonseca Bay."⁵³ Nicaragua offered no defense to the Court since it did not recognize the Court's jurisdiction. In the decision handed down March 2, 1917, four judges agreed in affirming all the charges of Salvador and declared that Nicaragua was obliged "to reestablish and maintain the legal status which existed before the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty."⁵⁴

When Nicaragua rejected the decision the Secretary of the Court wrote to the other Republics to insist that the award be respected.⁵⁵ There was no way to enforce the demand, however. Nicaragua sent a circular letter to the Central-American Governments in which it appealed to principles of international law to show that nations have the right to review awards of courts of arbitration and in case of ex-

⁴⁸ *For. Rel.*, 1916, p. 873. For a complete record of the case see *ibid.*, pp. 863-886.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 886.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 853-862.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 860.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 862.

⁵³ Enclosed in letter of Amer. Min. to Salvador to Sec. of State, December 2, 1916. *Ibid.*, pp. 890-891.

⁵⁴ *For. Rel.*, 1917, pp. 1103-1104.

⁵⁵ The Central American Court of Justice to the Governments of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, November 9, 1916. *Ibid.*, pp. 893-898.

ceeding of authority or injustice, to reject those awards.⁵⁶ On March 9, 1917, the Government of Nicaragua formally announced its intention of withdrawing from the Court giving as its principal reason the heavy expense it required.⁵⁷ In a letter to the United States Secretary of State the Nicaraguan Chargé at Washington added that, besides the expense, the Court had "degenerated plainly, after a long period of inactivity into a center of lively intrigues of the Central-American Governments incited against Nicaragua. . . ."⁵⁸

The dissolution of the Court was noticed with regret in Europe and America. The United States was severely criticized for its failure to force Nicaragua to abide by the decisions of the Court. There seems to have been little doubt that the Court had jurisdiction over the questions at issue and that the cases of both Salvador and Costa Rica were strong. On the other hand it is true that the Court had not always maintained the attitude of a tribunal "independent of and superior to the five governments" as its founders had hoped.⁵⁹

Nicaraguan Government officials saw in the \$3,000,000.00 canal fund a chance to satisfy unpaid employees and local claimants. New York bankers and foreign creditors looked to the United States to guarantee overdue payments to them.⁶⁰ Both groups could not be satisfied. However, with honest and efficient management it was possible for Nicaragua to meet its obligations in a reasonable length of time. The bankers wished to have a financial adviser appointed by the United States, but Chamorro, though he had recently been elected President with the support of the United States, refused to consider this proposal.⁶¹ Finally the Financial Plan of 1917 was agreed upon.⁶² This provided for the supervision of expenditures by a committee which became known as the High Commission. It was composed of a Nicaraguan citizen appointed by the Government of Nicaragua, a second member appointed by the Secretary of State of the United States, and a third "to act as umpire in case of disagreement" also appointed by the United States. The Government of Nicaragua was to have a fixed sum (\$80,000.00 per month) for enumerated expenses and \$15,000.00 more available for unforeseen expenses, to be especially approved by the High Commission. The customs col-

⁵⁶ Min. of Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua to the Governments of Costa Rica, Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, November 24, 1917. *For. Rel.*, 1917, pp. 1104-1111.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, March 9, 1917, p. 30.

⁵⁸ Nicaraguan Chargé d'Affaires to the Sec. of State, April 14, 1917. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁵⁹ Munro, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

⁶⁰ Brown Bros. & Co. and J. & W. Seligman & Co. to Sec. of State, July 17, 1916. *For. Rel.*, 1916, pp. 902-906.

⁶¹ Amer. Min. to Sec. of State, April 10, 1917. *For. Rel.*, 1917, p. 1123.

⁶² For text of this plan as enacted into law, see *For. Rel.*, 1917, pp. 1138-1141.

lection remained as before in the hands of Colonel Ham. Internal revenues were to be collected by the Nicaraguan Government unless for a three-month period they fell below \$100,000.00, when they might be taken over by the Collector-General of Customs. There were other measures to secure economy and efficiency. The Republic reserved the right to pay part or all of its obligations at any time and in case of complete cancellation of debt to take control of the customs. Any dispute which might arise was to be referred to the Secretary of State of the United States, whose decision would be final.

A few days after the Financial Plan was approved contracts were signed with the bankers providing for the disposition of the canal fund. About \$800,000.00 was paid to the foreign bondholders. Half the principal and all the interest owed to Brown Brothers & Company, and J. and W. Seligman & Co. was paid, amounting to around \$700,000.00 as well as \$26,500.00 for expenses. To Brown Brothers & Company an additional \$485,000.00 was paid as interested parties in the claims against the Government. A loan of the National Bank (about \$100,000.00) was paid with interest; a half million went to the Government of Nicaragua for payment of salaries, leaving about \$300,000.00 for local claimants.⁶³

Judging by results, the Financial Plan of 1917 was a wise arrangement. By the end of 1925 the total public debt of Nicaragua had been reduced from about \$22,000,000.00 in 1917 to \$6,625,203.00.⁶⁴ Although the financial supervision of the United States was unpopular in Nicaragua and the resultant dissatisfaction was one factor which led to civil war and military intervention in 1926, yet within the financial sphere Nicaragua was better off than any other Caribbean country.⁶⁵

The chief criticisms of United States policy in relation to the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty are: First, that the United States negotiated the Canal Treaty with a minority government kept in office only by the United States support. This was true. On the other hand Nicaragua was in this way saved from revolution for a long period. The Treaty in itself did not affect the sovereignty of the country and gave much needed financial aid. Second, the United States indirectly caused the death of the Central-American Court which it had helped to establish and was in duty bound to support. This also was true. Even if the Court at this time was not an impartial trib-

⁶³ Chargé of Nicaragua to Sec. of State, November 22, 1917. *Ibid.*, p. 1150.

⁶⁴ Message of President Coolidge to Congress, January 10, 1927. *Cong. Record*, 69th Cong., 2nd Sess., Vol. 68, p. 1326.

⁶⁵ D. G. Munro, "Basis of American Intervention in the Caribbean," in L. T. Beman, *Intervention in Latin America* (1928), p. 89.

unal the United States could probably have strengthened it and lengthened its life by giving up the treaty. It is doubtful whether the resentment among Latin Americans caused by this episode can be outweighed by the value of a couple of naval bases and an option on a canal route. The third criticism is that the Financial Plan of 1917 which grew in part out of the treaty gave to the United States practical control of the Government of Nicaragua. The plan did distinctly limit the sovereignty of the government within the financial sphere. On the other hand it resulted in unusual financial stability which would not have been possible without close supervision. Likewise since the plan could be terminated at any time by the discharge of debts, the limitation was by no means permanent or absolute.

NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF PUBLIC HEALTH IN SOUTH
CAROLINA, 1670-1800

ST. JULIEN RAVENEL CHILDS

The Citadel

Many questions present themselves in connection with the history of public health in the Province of South Carolina. For example, what were the effects on the settlers of the physical characteristics of the region, so different from those of the lands whence they had come? Did their bodies adapt themselves readily to the change? Did they suffer from it, or benefit? Did they encounter ailments to which they were strangers and escape others endemic in their former homes? Was the general health of the community such as to encourage or discourage immigration? What influence, if any, did hygienic conditions exercise on the new institutions gradually created in this new land? What means of protection were sought and tried? Were these original or mere transplantations from the old world? Were they at all efficacious? Do they reflect intelligence and energy or stupidity and sloth?

The questions multiply easily, but these suffice to indicate the possibilities of the subject. My inquiries thus far have been limited, and the resulting conclusions are, for the most part, tentative. In attempting to outline some of the latter, my purpose is chiefly to suggest that the quest is not futile but, rather, that it is practical and worth while.

All the diseases common in South Carolina during the colonial period appear to have been known to the English prior to their first settlement of the province in 1670, having been encountered either at home or in earlier American ventures. Certain maladies, however, became much more prevalent in the new plantation than in England or the other European countries and colonies which contributed largely to the peopling of South Carolina. Chief among these was malaria, which visited the pioneers on the Ashley River their first summer. The leaders had expected and rather dreaded "the fever and ague," but it began rather mildly.¹ This happy state of affairs

¹ That the colonists had been apprehensive is indicated by the energetic assurances of good health in their letters to the Proprietors written during the first year. One, dated nearly a year after the landing, goes so far as to assert that there had been only four cases of ague and fever. These letters are printed in the *Shaftesbury Papers*, Langdon Cheves, Editor, *S. C. Hist. Soc. Collections*, V. (1897). See especially pp. 180, 185, 193-5, 197, 203, 250, 275, 299, 305, 307, 308-9. The anxiety felt by the Proprietors (a natural result of the failure of the Cape Fear colony) is reflected in their prompt protest against the site chosen for the town, "so moorish that it must needs be unhealthy." *Ibid.*, pp. 342-343.

continued only a few seasons. In the next decade, its annual appearance became a serious matter.² Charles Town was long regarded by many as the center of infection,³ but by the middle of the eighteenth century its reputation was so far redeemed in this respect that prosperous planters began to abandon their stricken fields in the malarial months to take refuge in the provincial capital.⁴ After the Revolution, certain favored spots, either well elevated or on the edge of the sea, were recognized as safer, and the town as a resort was supplanted.⁵

So long as the transmission of malaria by mosquitoes was unknown, it was inevitable that the disease should be peculiarly prevalent in the southeastern coastal plain where long summers and stagnant pools offered abundant opportunities for the breeding of the insect carriers. European colonies in the West Indies, Mexico, and most parts of Central and South America had the advantage of more rugged terrain affording better drainage. Those to the north had greater variation of climate. The affliction was a feature of the country almost as unalterable as its climate and topography. All man could do was to attempt to minimize it by such remedies as were then known to him.⁶

The effects of malaria on South Carolina's history were numerous and profound. The seasonal migrations of wealthy planters above just mentioned were not without influence on her social develop-

² The first positive evidence that malaria had become prevalent is in a letter of a young immigrant, Thomas Newe, May 29, 1682, remarking, ". . . the most have a seasoning, but few dye of it." *Narratives of Early Carolina* (1911), ed. by A. S. Salley, Jr., p. 183. The Proprietors wrote on June 3, 1684, "We are by all people informed yt Charles Towne is no healthy scituation and yt it hath no good water in it and all people that come to the province and landing there & the most falling sick it brings a Disreputation upon the whole Country. . . ." *Records in Brit. Pub. Rec. Office*, ed. by A. S. Salley, Jr., 1663-1684 (1928), p. 293. That same summer and fall the disease became so general that the Proprietors were greatly alarmed. See their letters in *ibid.*, 1685-1690 (1929), pp. 4-5, 35-36. A strong statement of the unhealthful conditions in Charles Town that year is contained in a letter from Cardross and Dunlop to the Proprietors written the following March. *S. C. Hist. and Gen. Magazine*, XXX, 69-78.

³ That the Proprietors and Cardross and Dunlop so regarded it is evident in their letters referred to above.

⁴ This custom with the reasons therefor are set forth in a letter of 1768. Elizabeth Pinckney to Daniel Horry. H. H. Ravenel, *Eliza Pinckney* (1896), pp. 243-244.

⁵ Moultrieville (on Sullivan's Island), and Summerville were among such resorts.

⁶ As we are especially concerned with South Carolina, it is to be observed that topographical and climatic conditions were less favorable to malaria there than in Georgia, Florida and on the Gulf coast, but more favorable than in North Carolina. The assumption that malaria actually was most prevalent where natural features were most sympathetic is borne out by the reputation South Carolina gained in this respect after settlement. For the comparative freedom of the English West Indies from malaria, there is much evidence. See G. Pinckard, *Notes on the West Indies* (1806), 3 vols. Also references to the healthfulness of Barbados and the Bermudas in the early tracts of the Proprietors reprinted in Salley's *Narratives*.

ment. In quite another direction, it molded her institutions through the fact that the white man was more susceptible to it than the black. This reflection opens so wide a door to speculation and controversy that I shall not attempt to pursue it further here.

The disease probably played a part in delaying the permanent occupation by Europeans of the whole southeastern and Gulf coastal plains, but this could only be ascertained by a review of the records of the various plantations attempted from de Ayllon's of 1526 on to 1670. Of course other factors played a great part, such as the ferocity of the Indian tribes and the mutual rivalry of the colonizing powers.

That the disease served as a check on the growth of South Carolina's population after settlement seems fairly certain. It did so in three ways: first, as a cause of death among the white inhabitants; secondly, by giving the region a reputation for unhealthfulness which discouraged immigration; and, thirdly, by inducing settlers to move on, that is, acting as an incentive to emigration.⁷

In addition to malaria, there was a group of diseases, dysentery chief among them, from which the white population in South Carolina suffered more than in Europe, chiefly because of their failure to adapt their habits to the climate. They are not of any special historical significance.

Rattlesnakes seem to have been something more than a nuisance during the early years. In an act of 1705 fixing the duties of coroners, it was thought necessary to insert a special proviso that deaths from the bite of this reptile were to be regarded as violent and investigated as such.⁸ The popular remedy in those days was less consoling than that now in vogue. It consisted of a brew made from parts of the particular snake that had inflicted the wound. There is an authentic story of an elderly Goose Creek planter who, on being bitten, grabbed his adversary by the tail and yanked it from the hole in which it was vainly seeking sanctuary. Thus the sprightly old gentleman secured the ingredients for a broth by which his life was saved.⁹ The idea was that since a snake did not die of its own poison, there must be an antidote in its body.

The epidemics which visited South Carolina in the period 1670-1800 were small-pox and yellow fever. The former came in 1697-1698, 1711-1712, 1732, 1738, 1760, 1763, and 1780; the latter in

⁷ An instance of a whole group that emigrated partly on this account is that of the Dorchester colony in 1752-1756. "The Town of Dorchester," etc., by H. A. M. Smith in *S. C. Hist. and Gen. Mag.*, VI, 62-95.

⁸ T. Cooper, *Statutes at Large of S. C.*, II (1837), 273.

⁹ Letter of Dr. LeJau, D.D., to the S. P. G., 17 September, 1711, printed in H. Hirsch, *Huguenots of Colonial South Carolina* (1928), pp. 287-288.

1699, 1706, 1728, 1739, 1745, 1748, and 1792.¹⁰ These plagues caused the death of many people. They were, however, common occurrences in practically all American colonies at that period and so exercised no distinguishing influence on South Carolina. It is perhaps of interest to note in passing that, here as elsewhere, small-pox was peculiarly fatal to the Indians. Thus it may in some measure be regarded as an aid to the progress of the colony though perhaps a corresponding relative immunity to fevers on the part of the aborigines offset this advantage.

We turn now to the efforts of man to combat disease. Much might be expected of the Lord's Proprietors because of the distinguished ability of several, the experience of others in American colonization, and because they had as their secretary Dr. John Locke, one of the leading lights of the day in the field of medicine.¹¹ All such expectations will, however, be disappointed. The constitutions drawn up for the province by Locke could have been applied only in an old, long-settled community, and, if he made elsewhere more practical suggestions for guarding public health in Carolina, no record thereof has been preserved.¹² The Proprietors purchased a surgeon's chest and set of instruments to be taken with the first colony,¹³ and a "doctor," William Scrivener, who also went with that expedition may possibly have received special encouragement.¹⁴ A little later, in response to urging from their governor in Charles Town, they added a stock of medicines to the stores they had already sent out for sale to the settlers on credit at ten per cent profit.¹⁵ Their other activities on this score were limited to advice and directions, such as those for the founding of towns on healthy sites "as far from the sea as possible."¹⁶ They consented to the removal of Charles Town down stream to its present location, which had been recommended from Carolina, but, as soon as they heard of sickness there, regretted their decision and tried to get it moved again.¹⁷ Failing in this, they pre-

¹⁰ E. McCrady, *Hist. of S. C. under Royal Government, 1719-1776* (1899), pp. 428-429, *Hist. S. C. under Proprietary Government* (1897), p. 310. McCrady following David Ramsay (*Hist. S. C.*, 1858 ed. I, 46), incorrectly ascribes the date 1703 to the yellow fever outbreak of 1706; Ramsay misquotes Alexander Hewat (*Account of . . . the Colonies of S. C. and Ga.*, in B. R. Carroll, *Historical Collections of S. C.*, 1836, I, 160-161).

¹¹ *Dictionary of National Biography* (1885-1900), XXXIV, 27-37.

¹² Provisions bearing on public health are to be found in Articles 44 and 45 of the Fundamental Constitutions. Some of these may have influenced the provincial government.

¹³ *S. C. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, V, 150-151.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, V, 135. Dr. Henry Woodward joined the expedition at Nevis (pp. 190-191).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, V, 299, 329, 388; W. J. Rivers, *Sketch of the History of S. C.* (1856) pp. 383-384.

¹⁶ This was a fixed idea of the Proprietors and is to be found in practically all their orders and letters relating to the founding of towns.

¹⁷ *Rec. in Brit. P. R. O. 1668-1684*, pp. 135, 149, 225-226, 293.

scribed the closing of the courts from June 10 till October 10 so that people might not have to come to town in the malarial season.¹⁸

That the Proprietors did not do more is perhaps a testimonial to their inefficiency as a corporation rather than to indifference, for the growing ill repute of the province caused them a good deal of anxiety and they did their best to counteract it in the pamphlets they published to attract settlers.¹⁹ By the time the Crown rescinded the charter, South Carolina had grown sufficiently to look out for the health of its own people, or at least so the British ministers seem to have thought for I have found no expressions of concern from them except on one occasion when the Crown apparently recommended stricter quarantine laws.²⁰

The pioneer inevitably deprives himself of the services of many social agencies, and this was as true in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as it is in the twentieth. At that time the care of public health in England was largely in the hands of corporations such as had no duplicates in Carolina. These corporations were the towns, the endowed hospitals, and certain trade companies. The English municipalities looked after drainage, water supply and general police, built plague hospitals in time of epidemics, enforced local quarantines and supervised markets. In the endowed hospitals were entertained, oftentimes forcibly, many of the homeless, both sturdy vagabonds and sick paupers. The functions of the trade companies concerned with the public health varied. In London the Company of Parish Clerks collected and published mortality statistics; the Company of Apothecaries, the Company of Barber-Surgeons, and the College of Physicians each supervised the practice of its particular trade or profession, and the Physicians in addition had authority over the other two. South Carolina had no trade companies of any sort and no incorporated towns till after the Revolution.²¹ For the services rendered by these institutions in England she had only such substitutes as the provincial government, aided after 1704 by the Established Church, could supply. From the point of view of organization the province was in reality but a single, greatly extended township.

Undertaking to provide for its people on this basis, the provincial government legislated for the police, markets and drainage of Charles Town; enacted quarantine laws; built quarantine hospitals;

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 1685-1690, pp. 35-36.

¹⁹This will be noted in both Ashe's and Wilson's pamphlets and in Archdale's *Account*. These are in Salley's *Narratives of Early Carolina*.

²⁰Address to the Crown of 5 January, 1721, *Rec. in Brit. Pub. Rec. office* (MS transcripts in office of Hist. Com. of S. C.), IX, 1-3.

²¹Charleston, the first incorporated town, received its charter in 1783. D. J. McCord, *Statutes at Large of S. C.*, VII (1840) 97-101.

hired port physicians; supplied provincial troops with the services of surgeons, and encouraged with pensions inventors of new cures for snake bite.²² It would be difficult to say how much all these

²²Regulations for the sanitary police of Charles Town were included in an act of April 11, 1685, probably called forth by the sickly autumn preceding. *Ibid.*, VII, 1-3. More legislation on this subject was passed in succeeding years and, in 1710, a scavenger and clerk of the market was appointed with authority to enforce all sanitary acts. N. Trott, *Laws of . . . S. C.* (MS in office of Hist. Commission), *Temporary Laws*, 31-38. A market place in Charles Town was appointed by law in 1692 (*Statutes*, II, 73), but this same act of 1710 provided for the erection of a market and gave the clerk power to destroy unwholesome provisions. This official's salary was fixed at thirty pounds but he also received fees.

"Draines and sinks" in Charles Town are mentioned in a message of Governor Nicholson to the Assembly in 1721 (*Upper House Journals MS. 1721-1722*, p. 74), but the first act I have noted on the subject is one of 1725 for the rebuilding of the sea wall which ordered that a drain be constructed in Broad Street and authorized the building of others. N. Trott, *Laws of . . . S. C.* (1736), p. 436. As a result of a presentment by the Grand Jury in 1734 (*S. C. Gazette*, March 30, 1734), an act was passed the following March "for sinking a Drain in Broad-street, in Charlestown, and for cleansing and regulating the said street". Cooper, *Statutes*, III (1838), 405.

Small-pox in 1697-1698 brought about the prompt enactment of the first provisions for quarantine. *Ibid.*, II, 150-153. These were renewed in a law of 1707, evidently a product of the yellow fever of 1706, which provided for the building of a brick pest house (quarantine hospital), 30 ft. by 16 ft., on Sullivan's Island. Trott's *Laws* (MS), *Temporary Laws*, pp. 18-25. Small-pox recurring in 1711-1712, a new and much more rigid quarantine act was passed the latter year. This appointed a Commissioner at an annual salary of forty pounds plus fees, but he was not a physician. The fear of infection from Africa and the West Indies is indicated by special precautions against vessels from south of 30° N. *Statutes*, II, 382-385. The quarantine act of 1721, adopted in response to a royal injunction, was much less severe. *Ibid.*, III, 127-130. Small pox reappearing in 1732 seems to have been limited to a few cases by the prompt and energetic quarantine measures taken by the Governor. *S. C. Gazette*, March and April, 1732, *passim*. In 1738, however, it broke out again and an act ratified in September provided for interior quarantines and against inoculation. *Statutes*, III, 513-515. A law of 1744, guarding especially against importation of diseased negroes, refers to a new pest house on Sullivan's Island. *Ibid.*, III, 773-774. In 1749, the Assembly provided for a contagious hospital without the town. *Ibid.*, III, 720-723. A new pest house was again provided for in 1754, (Cooper, *Statutes*, IV, 1838, 11-12), and the quarantine law of 1759 refers to this building as being on Sullivan's Island, like its predecessors. *Ibid.*, pp. 78-86. The return of small-pox in 1760 brought a prompt renewal of interior quarantine and penalties on inoculation, May 30 of that year (*ibid.*, pp. 106-109), and an outbreak at Savannah four years later provoked more quarantine legislation. *Ibid.*, pp. 182-188. The increasing effectiveness of inoculation gradually lessened the fear of this disease and when, in 1783, the act of 1759 was revived with additions authorizing the construction of pest houses not only on Sullivan's Island, but also near Georgetown and Beaufort, the provisions against small-pox were specifically repealed. *Ibid.*, pp. 572-574. This act was replaced the following year by one throwing responsibility for the details of quarantine on the Governor. *Ibid.*, pp. 615-618 (amended in 1785. *Ibid.*, p. 668). In 1796, this duty was shifted from the Governor to the town authorities in the three ports, and the same act provided for the removal of the pest house from Sullivan's Island where it had become obnoxious, as that place was developing as a health resort. Cooper, *Statutes*, V (1839), 284-285. A tax levy was authorized in 1799 to reimburse the Charleston City Council for the cost of the new pest house it had erected on the n.e. point of James Island. *Ibid.*, VII, 113-114.

measures actually contributed to public health, but, certainly, the government did its best according to its lights. There was no lack of consciousness that the matter was an important one; no effort to ignore or sidestep it such as might have been expected in a frontier community.

One striking omission must, however, be noted. Of supervision over the practice of medicine, surgery, and pharmacy there was absolutely none.²³ The government did not undertake it and there was no other organization prior to the formation of the Medical Society in 1763 which could have done so. We do not know, of course, how many people suffered in consequence at the hands of dishonest or ignorant healers or vendors of drugs, but the number must have been considerable.

Originally the provincial government also kept mortality records²⁴ and provided for the care of paupers both sick and well²⁵ These functions were handed over to the Church by the acts of 1704 and 1706. The ecclesiastical organization being completely under lay control, its officials, other than the ministers, are scarcely distinguishable from other servants of the province. The clergy seem to have been faithful in performing their duty of visiting the sick but ordi-

There were port physicians as early as 1721. They were at first called "Product Masters." *Council Journal*, ed. by A. S. Salley, *May-June, 1721* (1930) p. 15; *Upper House Journal* (MS transcript), *July, 1721-March, 1722*, p. 42; *Rec. in B. P. R. O.* (MS transcripts in office of Hist. Com. of S. C.), IX, 16. The quarantine act of 1747 appointed six port physicians; *Statutes*, III, 694-696.

²³Perhaps an exception should be noted in that slaves were prohibited from administering drugs, or even working in shops where drugs were sold, by the Negro Act of 1751. *Statutes*, VII, 423. Yet, in 1758, we find the Assembly paying an annuity of fifty pounds "to the Negro Sampson for discovering a cure for the bite of rattlesnakes". *Ibid.*, IV, 67-73.

²⁴The Fundamental Constitutions and the Proprietors' "Temporary Laws" of 1670 provided for a "Register of Births, Buryals and Marriages." Rivers, *Sketch*, pp. 351-353. The first Register was appointed prior to Sept. 9, 1670. (*S. C. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, V, 181-182), and we find him quoting "our records" in a letter of 20 January, 1672. *Ibid.*, V, 379-382. Fees for the registration of births, marriages and burials, and penalties for neglecting to register them, were fixed by acts of Assembly in 1683, 1685, 1695 and 1696. *Statutes*, II, pp. V, 14-15, 86-92, 120-121. None of these records are known to survive but there can be little doubt that they once existed. In 1698 the minister of the single parish was appointed Register of Births, Marriages, Christenings and Burials. *Rec. in B. P. R. O.* (MS) IV, 20. In 1701, the post was conferred on the Clerk of the Church of England. *Journal of Commons House* (MS in office of Historical Commission), August 3-28, 1701, pp. 12-17. Thus, its connection with the Church antedated the Church Acts. This official is not to be confused with the Register of the Province, who was a register of deeds.

²⁵In caring for paupers, the province followed the ideas popular at the time, putting sturdy vagrants to work, binding out pauper children as apprentices, and giving or securing aid for those physically or mentally defective. *Journal of the Grand Council of S. C.*, ed. by A. S. Salley, Jr., 1671-1680 (1907), pp. 42-43, 49, 52; *ibid.*, 1692 (1907), p. 7; *Statutes*, II, 78, 116-117, 135-136. Poor laws were enacted in 1694, 1696, and 1698.

narly confined themselves to giving spiritual consolation.²⁶ Parish clerks appear to have been unaided in their recording of births or christenings, marriages and burials. Occasionally they put down the cause of death but this was not specified in the law although in London it had been required since early in the seventeenth century.²⁷ Consequently, those parish records that survive give us very meagre information on health conditions.

The care of the destitute devolved on the church wardens of the various parishes assisted by overseers of the poor appointed by the vestries.²⁸ Outside of Charles Town, the poor were provided for individually, but the town parish of St. Philip was authorized in 1736 to establish a hospital and workhouse. The character of this institution seems to have degenerated and, in 1768, the Assembly appropriated funds for a new building for the sick poor, that of 1736 to be used thenceforth only as a house of correction.²⁹ This hospital seems to have been maintained throughout the remainder of the century and was commonly designated as the Poor House.

During the small-pox epidemic of 1738, the wardens of St. Philip's hired a house to be used as a hospital for destitute persons afflicted with contagious diseases,³⁰ and, in 1749, the Assembly authorized them to set up such an institution, apparently on a more permanent basis and to be used especially for seamen.³¹

²⁶Perhaps they were often called upon for more in the rural parishes. See letter of minister of St. James', Santee, April 25, 1724, printed in Hirsch, *Huguenots*, pp. 320-321. Parsonages were also sometimes used as plague hospitals. *S. C. Gazette*, March 18, 25, April 1, 15, 22, 1732.

²⁷The bills of mortality issued by the London Company of Parish Clerks are well known and invaluable sources for the history of public health. Their history is given by Charles Creighton, *History of Epidemics in Britain* (1891), I, 320-322.

²⁸Poor Act of 1712. *Statutes*, II, 593-595. An act of 1721 created county and precinct courts and gave them supervision over the activities of church wardens and overseers. *Statutes*, VII, 173. In 1789, the powers of vestries and wardens in "providing for the poor . . . and to the binding out of poor children" were transferred to the judges of the county courts. *Statutes*, V, 118. In 1791, districts not having county courts were empowered to elect "Commissioners of the Poor". *Ibid.*, p. 175. In 1793, similar commissioners were authorized within the jurisdictions of the county courts. *Ibid.*, p. 232. In 1797, the collection of poor rates was transferred to the public tax collectors. *Ibid.*, p. 306.

²⁹A Grand Jury, on March 20, 1734, presented as a grievance the lack of "a Work House to punish idle and disorderly people". *S. C. Gazette*, March 30, 1734. The new institution was evidently expected to fill this need as well as that of a hospital. That it was actually constructed before April 11, 1737, seems probable from the election on that date of five "Commissioners of the Workhouse," the first of whom was Dr. Thomas Dale, a physician. *S. C. Gazette*, March 30, 1734, April 16, 1737; *Statutes*, VII, 90-92; J. J. Waring, "St. Philip's Hospital in Charlestown in Carolina", in *Annals of Medical History*, New Series, IV, 283-289.

³⁰*S. C. Gazette*, August 3, 10, 17, 1738.

³¹*Statutes*, III, 720-723.

Public hospitals established after the Revolution, having, of course, no connection with the church, included a "Seamen's Infirmary" in Charleston and a hospital for the poor in Georgetown. The former, initiated in 1783, was supported by a duty on all ships entering the port, levied by the state before the adoption of the Constitution.³²

Doctors, so-called, appear to have been quite plentiful in Charleston from the beginning. There were two with the first colony and there is record of more than a score who had been in the province before 1700.³³ Thirty-six are mentioned by name in the weekly *South Carolina Gazette* from 1732 to 1738, inclusive; probably some of these were plain quacks, others apothecaries or surgeons or men who had been apprenticed as such. Of *bona fide* physicians with university degrees, among the first known to have settled in South Carolina was Thomas Dale, M.D., of Leyden, who arrived about 1725.³⁴ Later the province had a rather surprising number of distinguished medical men.

The first mention of nurses is a casual one in 1704.³⁵ It required little training to become a nurse in that day and they were probably represented from the beginning.

The earliest reference I have seen to midwives is in a memorandum of 1746 complaining of their scarcity.³⁶ Later they became more plentiful.

The compounding of home remedies was a popular custom throughout the European world in the period we are examining, and probably nowhere more so than in this frontier land where the country people were usually far from the reach of any kind of "doctor," and the existence of strange herbs and creatures tempted the curious to experiment.

Of other influences affecting the health of the community, it is probable that the extremely transient character of its population during the period prior to the Yemassee War (1715), together with the comings and goings of Indian traders, pirates and smugglers, meant the bringing in of many diseases. To the importation of negroes from Africa, the outbreaks of small-pox were often attributed. The frequent incursions of yellow fever were doubtless partly due to Charles Town's West India trade, and the fact that that city is to-

³²*Ibid.*, IV, 657, V, 40, 244.

³³Woodward, Scrivener, John Thomas, Thomas and George Smith, Thomas Smyth, Bodett, Clark, Harris, Williams, Adams, Burnham, Hardy, La Bruce, Salmon, Porcher, Cordes, Guerard, Snow, Franklyn. Five of these were French Huguenots.

³⁴R. E. Seibels, "Thomas Dale, M.D.," in *Annals of Medical History*, new ser., III, 50-57.

³⁵Rev. Samuel Thomas to S. P. G. S. C. *Hist. and Gen. Mag.*, IV, 281.

³⁶"Journal of Robert Pringle," *ibid.*, XXVI, 27.

day the only known focus in the United States of filariasis, a mosquito borne disease,³⁷ may well be an inheritance from the extensive Barbadian immigration of colonial days, as Barbados has long been famous for this malady. To the notable increase of malaria in the country in the eighteenth century, the development of agriculture almost certainly contributed. Generous use of intoxicants, particularly West Indian rum, presumably did the people no good, and the persistence in the heavy meat diet popular in England must have had a good deal to do with the commonness of dysentery.

To conclude, I think we may safely concur in an opinion expressed by Washington in 1796,³⁸ that the state of health in South Carolina was below the average of contemporary English speaking communities in this country, a condition for which the prevalence of malaria appears to have been largely accountable. Knowledge of this fact, if such it be, seems to make more understandable a number of well-known features of South Carolina's early history, such as the relatively slow increase of her population, the general failure of small farmers in the coastal area, and the frequent pilgrimages of prosperous Carolinians to Europe.

³⁷Edward Francis, *Filariasis in Southern United States*, Hygienic Lab. Bul. No. 117, U. S. Public Health Service (1919). He ignores the Barbados connection.

³⁸Washington to Sir John Sinclair, 11 December, 1796, reprinted in Lyman Carrier, *The Beginnings of Agriculture in America* (1923), pp. 232-238.

SAMUEL SLATER, FATHER OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURES

D. H. GILPATRICK

Furman University

In a state where the inhabitants are wont to point with pride to the number of cotton spindles with almost the same degree of frequency with which they praise the salubrious climate, it can hardly be necessary to offer an apology for selecting as the subject of this paper, Samuel Slater, the English immigrant who, through the introduction into America of Arkwright's machinery, laid the real foundation for the textile industries of the United States. Even to the South Carolinian not interested in history, the name of Slater is not altogether unfamiliar. Fifteen miles from Greenville there is a town named Slater and this town is the home of the Slater Manufacturing Company. The cornerstone of this mill, laid on October 15, 1927, was a stone from one of Samuel Slater's early mills in Rhode Island.¹ In another connection the name of Slater has long been familiar in South Carolina and this is through the Slater Fund. This was established in 1882 by John Fox Slater, a nephew of Samuel Slater. Its purpose was stated as "the uplifting of the lately emancipated population of the Southern States and their posterity, by conferring on them the benefits of Christian education."² Numerous negro institutions of learning in South Carolina have been beneficiaries of this fund.³ From the foregoing, then, it is evident that Samuel Slater, directly or indirectly, has aided the southern state whose attitude toward the tariff he so lamented in the last few years of his life.⁴

The materials for a study of this pioneer manufacturer are not abundant. The few books or pamphlets available are impressive mainly for the length of their titles. In the preparation of this paper three works, more or less biographical in their nature, have been especially helpful. These are the writings of George Savage White, William R. Bagnall and Frederick L. Lewton. White's book is the one most frequently cited by secondary writers. The full title is

¹*Greenville Piedmont*, Oct. 12, 1927.

²*Report of the Commissioner of Education*, 1884 (1885), pp. lxiv-lxv.

³*Annual Report of the State Superintendent of Education of the State of South Carolina*, 1920 (1921), shows nine training schools receiving aid.

⁴George S. White, *Memoir of Samuel Slater, the Father of American Manufactures, connected with a History of the Rise and Progress of the Cotton Manufacture in England and America with Remarks on the Moral Influence of Manufactories in the United States* (1836), pp. 246-247. Slater speaks of the "anti-tariff folks" and hopes that "the great scarcity of money at this time, 1828, will have some effect on those dealers in negroes, who are opposed to the woollen and other bills before Congress." This *Memoir* is hereafter cited as "White."

Memoir of Samuel Slater, the Father of American Manufactures, connected with a History of the Rise and Progress of the Cotton Manufacture in England and America with Remarks on the Moral Influence of Manufactories in the United States. This memoir appeared in 1836, the year after Slater's death, and a second edition was published in 1846. Obviously, there is much material that concerns Slater only remotely, but amidst peans of praise for Alexander Hamilton and Tench Coxe may be found the most important facts of Slater's life, and, interspersed among lengthy discourses purporting to prove that factory workers are inherently of higher morality than agricultural laborers, one will come upon a limited number of letters from and to Slater.⁵ White, who had a personal acquaintance with Slater, claimed that he had "no party purpose to answer, no influence to court."⁶ His comments, however, on Slater are laudatory. Bagnall's book entitled *Samuel Slater and the Early Development of the Cotton Manufacture in the United States* appeared in 1890, the centennial year of Slater's first factory. It is a much shorter work than White's but contains some information not found in the earlier book.⁷ Mr. Lewton's sketch, "Samuel Slater and the oldest cotton machinery in America,"⁸ appeared in the *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution* for 1926. It is especially valuable for the accounts of the various mills built or purchased by Slater and his partners as well as for the Odyssey of Slater's original machinery.⁹

While the foregoing have proved the most helpful they do not, by any means, comprise all of the published material on Samuel Slater. The members of Slater's family have issued two illustrated booklets which add something to our knowledge. In 1912, S. Slater and Sons, Incorporated, published at Worcester, *The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, and, in 1917, the Slater Trust Company brought out at Pawtucket, *Pawtucket Past and Present, Being a Brief Account of the Beginning and Progress of its Industries and a Résumé of the Early History of the City*. While these, as might be expected, are somewhat filiopietistic in nature and not entirely without commercial motive, yet they contain certain information and are valuable for illustrations and bibliographies. Local histories of Rhode Island and Massachusetts naturally throw some light upon the subject. Note-

⁵See White, pp. 29-30, 213 for paucity of letters.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁷This book was published at Middletown, Conn. Bagnall is also the author of *The Textile Industries of the United States* (1893).

⁸Mr. Lewton was then serving as Curator of Textiles, United States National Museum.

⁹In addition to the above biographies there appears to have been one written by Smith Wilkinson, brother-in-law of Slater. Samuel Batchelder, *Introduction and Early Progress of the Cotton Manufacture* (1863), p. 44, cites such a work. See also White, pp. 30, 106.

worthy are Rev. Massena Goodrich's *Historical Sketch of the Town of Pawtucket*, published in 1876, and Leonard Bliss's *History of Rehoboth, Bristol County, Massachusetts, Comprising A History of the Present Towns of Rehoboth, Seekonk, and Pawtucket*, published at Boston in 1836. The latter work appeared the same year as White's *Memoir* and is much less adulatory. The limited number of newspapers which the writer was able to examine yielded little, especially for the first few years of Slater's activity in America. Although it was the custom for the newspapers of the 1790's to note with satisfaction the progress of home manufactures, the *United States Chronicle* published at Providence paid scant attention in 1790 to Slater's activities four miles away.¹⁰ General histories of the United States as a rule give little space to Slater. Naturally he receives more attention in economic histories. Textile encyclopedias, even when supplemented with a chronological table, have been known to omit his name.¹¹ From the material available an attempt has been made in this paper to present the life of Samuel Slater, although no effort is made to master or portray the technicalities of the machinery constructed by this "Arkwright of America."

Biographers frequently attribute a man's subsequent characteristics and achievements to the time and place which produced him. Certainly this explanation possesses some validity with reference to the subject of this paper. Samuel Slater was born at Belper in Derbyshire in 1768. This was four years after Hargreaves invented the spinning jenny, one year before Richard Arkwright and James Watt obtained their first patents and one year also before the birth of Wellington and Bonaparte. There can be no doubt of the importance of the decade of the 1760's in England's history even if some disagree with the pronouncement that "to Arkwright and Watt England is far more indebted for her triumphs, than to Nelson and Wellington,"¹² or if one declines to accept Carlyle's dictum that "the true epic of our times is not 'Arms and the Man' but 'Tools and the Man'."¹³ The place as well as the time of Slater's birth was important because Belper was to have its first cotton mill in 1776¹⁴ and that mill was owned and directed by Jedediah Strutt to whom Slater afterwards referred as his "old master."¹⁵

¹⁰The issue of July 29, 1790 contains a rather vague reference.

¹¹*The Textile Industries* (1910), a work in 8 volumes, contains a chronological table from which the name of Slater is absent. It merely lists "1788, First American cotton factory built at Beverly, Mass."

¹²E. Baines, *History of the Cotton Manufactures* (1835), quoted by White, p. 221.

¹³Quoted by Augustine Jones, *Moses Brown, His Life and Services* (1892), p. 5.

¹⁴White, pp. 223-225.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 31.

Slater was the fifth son of "a respectable yeoman" who through the purchase of lands and the selling of timber was able to give Samuel "a good education in the common English branches" and the lad, we are told, was "especially adept in Arithmetic and other Mathematics."¹⁶ Early in 1783 Slater was apprenticed to Jedediah Strutt as a cotton-spinner.¹⁷ This apprenticeship has been, perhaps with exaggeration, termed "the initial step toward cotton manufacturing in America."¹⁸ Some of the shrewdness for which the later mill owner was noted must have been present in the boy of fifteen, for, before entering upon his apprenticeship, young Slater asked Strutt if he considered cotton-spinning a *permanent* business and the reply was, "It is not probable, Samuel, that it will always be as good as it is now, but I have no doubt it will always be a *fair* business, if it be well managed."¹⁹ In 1783 Strutt's pronouncement could be deemed authoritative for he was closely related to the nascent cotton industry in England. He was inventor of the Derby-ribbed stocking machine. Furthermore, in 1776 Arkwright and Strutt had built a cotton mill at Belper and soon after these two had erected other mills at the neighboring towns of Milford and Cromford. In 1781 (two years before Slater's apprenticeship) the Arkwright-Strutt partnership had been dissolved, Arkwright retaining the Cromford establishment, while Strutt kept the mills at Belper and Milford. It was in the latter mill that Slater entered upon his apprenticeship in 1783.²⁰ It is obvious that he was not working for a novice. It was what in later days would be termed a great opportunity for an ambitious youth to work under the direction of Jedediah Strutt in a mill equipped with the machinery evolved by Richard Arkwright.

For six and a half years Slater remained with Strutt at Milford. After he had completed his term of indenture he remained at the mill as a sort of general overseer "both as respected making machinery and the manufacturing department."²¹ This was most fortunate because "this general employment, with his close observation—and retentive memory, was of great service to him in afterwards assisting him to erect his first mill at Pawtucket."²² If Slater had

¹⁶William R. Bagnall, *Samuel Slater and the Early Development of the Cotton Manufacture in the United States* (1890), p. 26. Hereafter cited as "Bagnall". See also White, pp. 31, 40, 41.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 33, 40, 41; Bagnall, p. 26.

¹⁸Samuel Slater and Sons, Incorporated, *The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912* (1912), p. 14. Cited hereafter as *The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*.

¹⁹White, pp. 33-34.

²⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 33, 41, 225; Bagnall, p. 25.

²¹White, p. 41.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 35.

left Milford at the expiration of his apprenticeship, his venture in Rhode Island might have resulted less successfully.

Despite the assurances given him by Strutt a few years earlier, Slater had a fear that "cotton spinning would be overdone in England";²³ and he had "contemplated trying America for some time."²⁴ This resolution was strengthened by accounts in the newspapers of the great interest in manufactures being shown at the time in the United States. He was particularly impressed by the bounties and rewards offered in Pennsylvania both by the legislature and by local societies.²⁵ Having determined to try his fortune in America, he decided to reveal his intention to no one, even to the members of his family. He was fully conscious of the difficulties attendant upon his departure. England at that time was determined to retain as her exclusive possession all of the knowledge regarding the new textile improvements. "No skilled mechanic was permitted to leave the country. No machinery was sold abroad. No person could take passage to the United States without being submitted to a thorough search and severe punishment awaited one who would attempt to smuggle knowledge in tangible form across the Atlantic."²⁶ Mindful of these conditions, Slater took with him neither patterns nor memoranda. In the new world he would depend solely on his memory. He did, however, hide about his person his certificate of apprenticeship to Strutt. His appearance, we are told, was in his favor because he resembled a country lad rather than a mechanic possessed of valuable technical secrets.²⁷ He arrived in New York in November, 1789, after a passage of sixty-six days.²⁸

When Slater landed in New York the manufacture of cotton goods had scarcely reached the factory stage. Ineffective beginnings had been made both at Beverly and at Bridgewater, Mass., where Hargreaves's spinning jenny had been reproduced in a somewhat imperfect form. The movement had spread into Rhode Island where machinery had been set up first at Providence and then at Pawtucket. Moses Brown, wealthy Quaker and benefactor of Rhode Island College, had purchased some of this experimental machinery located at Pawtucket and it was to Brown that Slater later applied. These early

²³*Ibid.*, p. 39.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 36.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 37; Bagnall, pp. 28, 87-88; *The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, p. 7; *The Slater Trust Company, Pawtucket Past and Present Being a Brief Account of the Beginning and Progress of its Industries and a Résumé of the Early History of the City* (1917), p. 9. Hereafter cited as *Pawtucket Past and Present*. These accounts vary somewhat as to just what attracted Slater to America.

²⁶*The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, pp. 7-8. See also E. L. Bogart, *Economic History of the United States* (1918), p. 151.

²⁷White, p. 37.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 41.

industrial undertakings all proved futile.²⁹ The cause of failure was to be found neither in lack of zeal nor financial backing. The meagre achievements can be attributed to the absence of the most improved machinery and to the dearth of skilled artisans. By 1790 an incipient stage of jenny-spinning had been attained but we are told that this was unsatisfactory and that "nothing but the introduction of the 'water-frame spinning' [of Arkwright] which had superseded the jennies in England, could have laid a foundation for the cotton manufacture in the United States."³⁰ And it was this type of spinning that Slater was destined to introduce successfully after several months of patient and arduous labor.

In New York Slater was employed for a short time by the New York Manufacturing Society, a company of recent organization in whose future the new employee had little confidence.³¹ He was about to leave New York for Philadelphia when a captain of a Providence packet advised him to write to Moses Brown who "like many men of large wealth and patriotic impulses—was impressed with the importance of the establishment of domestic manufacture."³² Acting upon the captain's advice Slater wrote to Brown on December 2, 1789. He stated that he could "give the greatest satisfaction in making machinery, making good yarn either for stockings or twist as any that is made in England" since he had had "an oversight of Richard Arkwright's works and in Mr. Strutt's mill upwards of eight years." In conclusion he asserted that it was his ambition to build new carding and spinning machinery.³³ To this application the Quaker entrepreneur replied on December 10, 1789. He gave a full account of the "experiment" being made with "imperfect" spinning frames at Pawtucket by William Almy and Smith Brown, two of his kinsmen, and thus stated the main difficulty: "We are destitute of a person acquainted with water-frame spinning", adding that "if thou thoughtst thou could perfect and conduct them to profit," certain financial arrangements could be made and Slater with his new associates might "have the credit as well as the advantage of perfecting the first water-mill in America."³⁴

²⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 47-49, 52-53, 57, 61-63, 65, 68, 71; Bagnall, pp. 32-37; Augustine Jones, *Moses Brown, His Life and Service*, p. 26; Samuel Batchelder, *Introduction and Early Progress of the Cotton Manufacture*, p. 48; E. L. Bogart, *Economic History of the United States*, pp. 152-153; J. B. McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States* (1921), II, 163-165; *United States Chronicle*, Sept. 24, 1789, Jan. 28, July 29, 1790.

³⁰White, p. 68.

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 72; Bagnall, p. 29.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 32.

³³*The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, pp. 25-26; White, p. 72.

³⁴*The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, pp. 26-29; Bagnall, pp. 38-39; White, pp. 72-73; Brown in a later letter describing the attempts of Almy and Brown wrote, "We had in 1789 got several jennies and some weavers at work

This correspondence resulted in Slater's departure for Providence some time in January, 1790.³⁵ On January 18, 1790, Moses Brown took Slater out to Pawtucket to see the machinery in possession of Almy and Brown. To the workman who recalled the Arkwright models back home in Strutt's factory, the devices assembled in Pawtucket seemed worthless and he unhesitatingly pronounced them so. Moses Brown then reminded him, "Thee said—that thee could make machinery. Why not do it?" The proposal was accepted and Strutt's pupil vowed that he would make machinery which would produce yarn as good as any in England.³⁶ Then began probably the most crucial period in Slater's life when he attempted to reproduce, solely from memory, Arkwright's water-frame and other necessary devices. Throughout the months of 1790 (during part of which time Rhode Island was hesitating to enter the federal union) he labored amidst the greatest difficulties in the old fulling mill of Ezekiel Carpenter whose water wheel was to furnish the motive power for his important venture. Workmen were difficult to secure. The water wheel froze in cold weather. It was hard to keep the process secret and Moses Brown was impatient with the delay,³⁷ but in the face of all obstacles the new enterprise started on December 20, 1790, with "three cards, drawing and roving, and seventy-two spindles."³⁸ After about twenty months of operation the new factory had glutted the local market with all-cotton yarn. Nevertheless, Slater's machines had worked successfully and the same machines were in operation twenty-seven years later when President James Monroe visited Pawtucket.³⁹ How much longer this original machinery saw active service is not definitely known, but it is an established fact that in 1856 a portion of it was turned over to the Rhode Island Society for the Encouragement of Domestic Industry. This was only the beginning, however, of its migratory career. It was exhibited at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in 1876. Four years later it was presented to Brown University, only to be deposited in 1883 in the National Museum at Washington. The National Museum lent it to New Orleans in 1884 and to the Pawtucket Centenary in 1890. Souvenir hunters appropriated many of its more easily detached parts with

on linen warps but have not been able to get cotton warps to a useful degree of perfection on the jennies". See Bagnall, pp. 37-39.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 13. Secondary works generally give 1789 as the date of Slater's first mill in America. This is obviously incorrect.

³⁶White, pp. 73-74; Bagnall, pp. 39-40; *The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, p. 13; *Pawtucket Past and Present*, p. 10.

³⁷White, pp. 85, 96-98; Massena Goodrich, *Historical Sketch of the Town of Pawtucket* (1876), p. 43. Cited hereafter as "Goodrich."

³⁸Perry Walton, *The Story of Textiles* (1912), p. 173.

³⁹White, p. 202.

the result that when it returned to Washington it had lost nearly half of its bobbins and spindles.⁴⁰

Long before the first machinery had been completed a partnership had been entered into between William Almy and Smith Brown on the one part and Samuel Slater on the other. Almy and Brown were to furnish the capital and the material while Slater was to provide the skill and the labor. He was to have one-half interest and to bear one-half of the operating expenses and was not to dispose of his interest to anyone other than Almy or Brown.⁴¹ Accurate knowledge as to the labor employed is obtainable from the "carders' and spinners' time list" for the first month, which has been preserved. In the first week four young boys were employed, while during the third week the force consisted of seven boys and two girls. There was no change in the fourth week.⁴²

The fact should not pass unnoticed that during his early days in Pawtucket Slater boarded in the home of Oziel Wilkinson, father of five sons, all of whom were blacksmiths. The Wilkinsons had a "steel manufactory" which made hardware of various kinds, ranging from paper-mill supplies to anchors. In fact there is contemporary evidence that the Wilkinsons "were long household words in Pawtucket."⁴³ Slater promptly fell in love with Oziel Wilkinson's daughter, Hannah. His suit was not looked upon with favor by the family because he was not a Quaker, but, none the less, he and Hannah were soon married.⁴⁴ This marriage was important because Hannah Slater was a most valuable partner. To her is attributed the distinction of making the first cotton thread on her spinning wheel, thereby displacing the linen thread formerly used.⁴⁵ Furthermore, the whole Wilkinson family subsequently aided Slater in his various undertakings.⁴⁶

The cotton yarn produced by Almy, Brown and Slater was apparently of excellent quality.⁴⁷ Some of it was sent to England for

⁴⁰Frederick L. Lewton, "Samuel Slater and the Oldest Cotton Machinery in America," *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution, 1926 (1927)*, pp. 508-511. Hereafter cited as "Lewton".

⁴¹White, pp. 74-75; Bagnall, pp. 40-41. The partnership was entered into April 5, 1790. Almy was Moses Brown's son-in-law and Smith Brown was his cousin.

⁴²White, p. 99; Bagnall, pp. 44-45; Lewton, pp. 505-506.

⁴³White, pp. 102, 106; Goodrich, pp. 35-36, 51; *United States Chronicle*, February 18, 1790.

⁴⁴Ten children were born of this union. Six sons reached maturity. Hannah Slater died in 1812. In 1817 Slater married a Mrs. Parkinson who outlived him.

⁴⁵White, pp. 262-263; Bagnall, p. 49; *The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, p. 36; *Pawtucket Past and Present*, pp. 13-14. The date is variously given as 1792 or 1793.

⁴⁶White, p. 189.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 71, 83-85; Bagnall, p. 46.

the critical appraisal of Jedediah Strutt⁴⁸ and in 1791 samples were sent to Alexander Hamilton.⁴⁹ Henry Clay, writing in 1835, paid tribute to Slater and added that he still had in his possession some of the first yarn spun in the old Pawtucket mill.⁵⁰ At first the finished yarn was disposed of locally and was woven "in the homes of the people."⁵¹ By such an arrangement the supply soon exceeded the demand "notwithstanding every exertion was made to weave it up and sell it,"⁵² and the apprehensive Moses Brown adjured Slater, "Thee must shut down thy gates, or thee will spin up all my farms into cotton yarn."⁵³

This first instance of overproduction in the American textile industry may have been exaggerated or the best minds of one hundred and forty years ago may have been resourceful in finding a way out. At any rate, it is a matter of record that Slater, along with the same William Almy and Obadiah Brown (the only son of Moses Brown) had determined early in 1793 to build a "mill especially designed for cotton spinning."⁵⁴ The site on the Blackstone River at Pawtucket had been purchased late in 1791, but construction did not start until 1793. On July 12 of that year the new mill began operation with the old machinery transferred from Ezekiel Carpenter's fulling mill.⁵⁵ The number of spindles was gradually increased as the market appeared more promising. The "Old Slater Mill" was still standing in 1926, and was intended at that time to be preserved as a textile museum.⁵⁶

In the closing years of the 18th century Slater began work on a third cotton mill. This was located just across the Blackstone River in what was then Rehoboth, Massachusetts.⁵⁷ It has been said that this mill was the first one "in Massachusetts that operated successfully the Arkwright type of machine."⁵⁸ It started operation in 1801 and Slater's partners this time were his father-in-law, Oziel Wilkinson and Timothy Green and William Wilkinson, his brothers-in-

⁴⁸White, p. 39; *Pawtucket Past and Present*, p. 12.

⁴⁹White, p. 89.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, p. 422, letter of Clay to White endorsing White's proposal to write the *Memior*.

⁵¹Bagnall, p. 50.

⁵²White, p. 42; Lewton, p. 505; *Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, p. 13; *Pawtucket Past and Present*, p. 13.

⁵³Goodrich, p. 46.

⁵⁴Bagnall, p. 46.

⁵⁵White, p. 42; Bagnall, pp. 45-46; Goodrich, p. 47; *Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, pp. 13-14.

⁵⁶Lewton, p. 506. Slater retained his interest in this mill until his financial difficulties in 1829. See White, p. 244.

⁵⁷In 1862 a change was made in the Massachusetts-Rhode Island boundary and Rehoboth became a part of the latter state.

⁵⁸Lewton, p. 506.

law.⁵⁹ For a time Slater acted as superintendent of both mills receiving \$1.50 per day at each mill.⁶⁰ Clearly the day of high-salaried executives had not yet dawned. Within six years after the factory was opened in Rehoboth, Slater was opening another, in association with his former partners, Almy and Brown, and his brother John Slater, who had come over from England in 1803 and is said to have been much more receptive to new methods than was Samuel, had selected the site for this new mill at Smithfield, Rhode Island. The projected establishment opened in the Embargo year, 1807,⁶¹ and was the real beginning of the mill village at Slatersville, Rhode Island, which had expanded in a rather remarkable manner by 1819.⁶²

By 1807 Slater had been concerned with the establishment of four different mills. Three of them were in operation at the outbreak of our second war with England.⁶³ This conflict, with the attendant demand for American goods, definitely "decided the success of Mr. Slater's business."⁶⁴ Shortly before the outbreak of hostilities, feeling that the Pawtucket community was amply supplied with cotton yarn and that a new outlet was essential, Slater embarked upon the additional enterprise which was to be his major concern during the last few years of his life. In partnership with Bela Tiffany, land and power rights were purchased at Oxford, Massachusetts, in 1811. This was the genesis of the Slater cotton mills at Webster which were destined to become a most extensive enterprise.⁶⁵

The list of Slater's enterprises is not yet complete. In 1815, in partnership with Edward Howard, he opened a woolen mill at Webster. Later he bought out Howard's share and took three of his sons into partnership.⁶⁶ In the 1820's he purchased an interest in a cotton mill in New Hampshire on the Merrimac.⁶⁷ In the same decade in partnership with others he erected in Providence the first cotton mill operated by steam power. This was long known as the "Steam Mill" and was a very successful undertaking.⁶⁸ That Slater prospered from

⁵⁹White, p. 106; Bagnall, p. 52; Goodrich, p. 48. Lewton states that Slater retained his interest in this mill until 1810. Bagnall gives the date as 1819.

⁶⁰Lewton, p. 506; White, p. 189.

⁶¹White, pp. 191, 259; Lewton, p. 507; Bagnall, pp. 62, 64-65. These writers differ as to the length of time that Slater retained his interests at Slatersville.

⁶²White, p. 259.

⁶³After the opening of the Pawtucket mill in 1793, work was abandoned in Ezekiel Carpenter's fulling mill.

⁶⁴White, p. 190; Lewton, p. 507.

⁶⁵*Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, pp. 21-25; Lewton, pp. 507-508; Bagnall, p. 65; Slater renamed the village Webster because of his admiration for Daniel Webster. Tiffany retired in 1818 and Slater became sole owner.

⁶⁶*Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, pp. 10, 22. White, pp. 245-246; Bagnall, pp. 65-66.

⁶⁷Bagnall, p. 67; Lewton, p. 507. 1826 and 1822 are the dates given for this purchase.

⁶⁸White, p. 245; Lewton, p. 508; Walton, *The Story of Textiles*, p. 184.

these various interests is proved beyond a doubt. Rather definite information regarding his wealth is obtainable by reason of the fact that inventories of his assets were made both in 1817 and 1829. These show not only mills but valuable real estate holdings and bank stock.⁶⁹ There were times, however, when he was not prosperous and one of these was in 1829 when he suffered grave financial losses on account of endorsement of his friends' notes. It was necessary at this crisis for him to dispose of his interests in the "Old Mill" at Pawtucket and in the mill at Slatersville.⁷⁰ He managed to weather the storm but with "a considerable loss of property" and "a loss of confidence in men of business in general." It is said that he had not fully regained this confidence in his fellow-men when he died in 1835.⁷¹

In 1833, sixteen years after James Monroe's visit, Slater received another president. This time Andrew Jackson and Vice-President Van Buren called upon the pioneer manufacturer at Pawtucket. Jackson, after addressing Slater as "the father of American manufactures," said, "I understand—you taught us how to spin, so as to rival Great Britain in her manufactures; you set all these thousands of spindles at work—." In reply, Slater acknowledged that he "gave out the psalm, and they have been singing to the tune ever since." The vice-president inquired as to Slater's material returns and was assured that the veteran promoter "had obtained a competency"; although there was not then much money in the cotton-spinning business he opined that it was probably "as good as raising corn at 50c per bushel."⁷²

If we ask what manner of man Samuel Slater was, we may be sure that he was possessed not only of indomitable energy but of a native ability bordering upon genius. For twenty years he worked sixteen hours a day.⁷³ He devoted himself almost exclusively to business and paid little attention to literature or politics.⁷⁴ White is authority for the fact that his main ambition was "to leave his children in a permanent and lucrative business, as his old master, Strutt, left his sons."⁷⁵ This same author asserts that his "benevolence and philanthropy were co-extensive with his means,"⁷⁶ but, on the other hand,

⁶⁹White, pp. 215, 247-48, 263. His real and personal property in 1829, exclusive of his woollen mill, was estimated by his brother as \$690,000.

⁷⁰White, pp. 244, 246, 248; Lewton, p. 508.

⁷¹White, p. 245; *Manufacturers' and Farmers' Journal and Providence and Pawtucket Advertiser*, April 23, 1835, for notice of Slater's death.

⁷²White, pp. 263-264; *Manufacturers' and Farmers' Journal and Providence and Pawtucket Advertiser*, June 24, 1833.

⁷³White, p. 77.

⁷⁴*Ibid.*, p. 219.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, p. 263.

the editors of the *Pawtucket Chronicle* declare that he "was not exactly a generous man," that he "gave little to public institutions" and that "Bonaparte never pursued schemes of conquest—more constantly than did Samuel Slater his business—."⁷⁷ He favored good roads and later railways for business reasons.⁷⁸ Naturally he was a zealous advocate of the protective tariff and spoke with scorn of the "anti-tariff folks."⁷⁹ Once, at least, he even journeyed to Washington to agitate for a measure of protection.⁸⁰ He was slow to adopt new methods and for a long time he preferred Surinam cotton to that grown in the southern states.⁸¹ Over his workmen he exercised a "mild and paternal scrutiny."⁸² He was severe with the young men in his employ if they "spent all their earnings in dress and follies."⁸³ His old master, Jedediah Strutt, had maintained Sunday schools for his employees and Slater followed his example in the new world, although it cannot be proved, as is sometimes claimed, that he started the first Sunday school in America or even in New England. In 1796 Slater applied to Jonathan Maxcey, president of Rhode Island College (later the first president of South Carolina College) for a college student to teach his Sunday school.⁸⁴ There are evidences that Slater had trouble at times with his workers and that they left his employ and set up other mills.⁸⁵ Whatever may have been his virtues or his faults we can rest assured that he deserves the appellation given him by his biographer, the "Arkwright of America."

⁷⁷Leonard Bliss, *The History of Rehoboth, Bristol County, Massachusetts, Comprising a History of the Present Town of Rehoboth, Seekonk, and Pawtucket* (1836), p. 237. Bliss states that his information on Slater was supplied by Messrs. Ronsmaniere, editors of the *Pawtucket Chronicle*. *The Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912* quotes part of this passage omitting the more uncomplimentary sentences.

⁷⁸White, p. 239.

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 246-247.

⁸⁰Edward Stanwood, *American Controversies in the Nineteenth Century* (1903), Vol. 1, 238.

⁸¹White, p. 367.

⁸²*Ibid.*, p. 108.

⁸³*Ibid.*, p. 220.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 107-108, 117, 263, 281; Bagnall, p. 49; *Slater Mills at Webster, 1812-1912*, p. 31; *Pawtucket Past and Present*, p. 12. The dates given for Slater's Sunday school are 1793 and 1799. *The Columbian Centinel*, April 20, 23, 1791, mentions a Sunday school in connection with a Duck Manufactory in Boston.

⁸⁵White, pp. 106, 107, 183, 219.

WILLIAM PRYNNE, A PORTRAIT

LAURA ELLEN HOWARD

Coker College

The London of the seventeenth century was fast becoming England.¹ Its streets, although still within its mediaeval walls, resounded busily with the prosperous life of the city and trade. The new and highly sensitive middle class regarded the extravagant court as a menace to the sacred right of property. The frugal Puritan felt that it was sinful to waste so much in idle and riotous living. He worked hard at his trade, went to church, sang psalms and read his Bible. So keenly alive to the contrasts were the Londoners in these busy streets that the rumors of the pomp and show of idle courtiers only four miles away at Westminster and Whitehall started a low rumbling of protest which was to become the storm which destroyed a king and an archbishop. "London was a stage brilliantly set for the gay court life; but enhancing its high lights were the dark shadows of the somber-clad Puritans, passing to and fro in the streets as they plied their trades, or standing in the crowds in the background, observing, listening, frowning, waiting."²

There were thousands upon thousands, who, impelled by numerous motives, raised their voices in protest against the infringement of English rights, and the struggle in the House of Commons to safeguard the liberty and freedom of Englishmen found a sympathetic ear in the streets of London. The country gentry, men like Hampden and Pym, were to save England. In the exuberant language of Macaulay "a great and terrible crisis came. A direct attack was made by an arbitrary government on a sacred right of Englishmen, on a right which was the chief security of all other rights. The nation looked around for a defender. Calmly and unostentatiously the plain Buckingham Esquire placed himself at the head of his countrymen and right before the face and across the path of tyranny."³ While these prophets of a new day earnestly and zealously prepared their petitions and their remonstrances the city growled and talked and read pamphlets. These crowds were to play the leading rôle in the struggle between King and Parliament when they found a leader

¹For general material on the complex problems of England during the Stuart period see G. M. Trevelyan, *England Under the Stuarts* (1926). S. H. Gardiner's *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution* (1911) is the greatest work on the period. R. H. Tawney's *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1922) is excellent. For London see John Stow, *Survey of London*, edited by C. L. Kingsford (1915).

²E. Easton, *Roger Williams* (1930), Introduction, p. 39.

³T. B. Macaulay, *Critical, Historical Essays*, Vol. 1, "John Hampden," p. 103.

whose voice could crystallize their numerous grievances—one who was to appear in their midst a martyr to the cause of liberty. Him they were destined to follow with unquestioned devotion until King and Archbishop were both silent in the grave. Such a leader appeared in the person of one William Prynne.

William Prynne in 1621 came to this city, whose actions and opinions he was to personify.⁴ Admitted as a student in Lincoln's Inn, he studied both law and theology. Already he had received his B.A. degree from Oxford where Wyclif's ghost still stalked in spite of regulations to lay it. Puritan and pamphleteer was Prynne before he left Oxford, for even there political and religious feeling ran high and pamphlets were busy. He pursued the same course at Lincoln's Inn and became a modestly successful barrister and an inordinately successful pamphleteer. Prynne was called to the bar in 1628 and had published his first theological pamphlet the year before. With a mind fresh from his theological studies, with a gift for oratory, with incomparable energy he built up his arguments on vehement iteration. Fortified by a tenacious memory and a strength of will bordering on obstinacy, he shouted out battle cry after battle cry against the evils of his day. With no sense of proportion and no sympathy for the frailties of humanity, he violently and at great length assailed everything and everybody. He had no personal attachments, it would seem, no friends and no family. With an undeviating singleness of purpose he married himself to The Cause. Extravagantly austere and intolerant, William Prynne was Puritanism in its most extreme form. When his victims committed the error of attempting a rebuttal, he reached the pinnacle of fame—the martyr who suffered for the people's wrongs at the hands of a tyrant.

He first took up his pen in earnest to reform the customs and manners of Stuart England, which appeared in his eyes scandalous and ungodly. He voiced the opinion of many a man in seventeenth century England: health drinking, the long hair of men, the stage, sports, ceremonialism in the church, all lay prostrate before his fine scorn. Prynne wrote his first pamphlet in 1628, *Health's Sickness*, "a discourse proving the drinking of healths to be sinful." This was a vice "which cracks men's credit, exhausts their purses, consumes their estates, infatuates their senses, besots their understandings, impairs

⁴The material on William Prynne is scant, his personal life is practically unknown. A life of him is given in A. Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (ed. Bliss, III, 844). S. H. Gardiner has an article on Prynne in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. 22. Also another article by C. H. Firth is to be found in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. In R. P. T. Coffin, *Life of Laud* (1930) there is a chapter on Prynne. I have used Dr. Coffin's book quite freely for quotations from Prynne's pamphlets, though I examined them at the British Museum and Lincoln's Inn Library in 1931.

their healths, distempers their constitutions, subverts their bodies, eats out their lives, ruins their families, grieves their friends, brings wrath and judgments on their countries, decays their parts and moral virtues, disables them from all employments, indisposeth them to grace and godliness and all means and works of grace, and without God's infinite mercy and their sound repentance, damns their souls."⁵ Stuart England appeared on the streets with its male head all over curls. *The Unloveliness of Lovelocks* condemns "these lovelocks, or earlocks, in which too many of our nation have of late begun to glory, whatever they may seem to be in the eyes and judgments of many humorous, singular, effeminate, ruffianly, vainglorious, or time-serving persons, who repute or deem them very generous, necessary, beautiful, and comely ornament, are yet notwithstanding so many badges or infamy, effeminacy, vanity, singularity, pride, lasciviousness and shame in the eyes of God and in the judgment of all godly Christians and grave and civil men." And furthermore he continues, "Beloved, these times wherein we live are times of grief, of sorrow, misery, trouble, and affliction, which summon us to fasting, weeping, mourning, to baldness and sackcloth."⁶

For a time after these outbursts Prynne struck at Arminianism and at the practice of ceremonialism in the Church. Nothing caused more irritation to the Puritan than the custom of bowing and genuflection, for the controversy of the time was more over ceremonial usage than doctrine. Prynne exposed the sin of bowing at the name of Jesus for angels had no knees. The leaders of the Church believed in the sobering influence of appointed prayers and appointed ceremonies, as a means of counteracting the tyrannical and superstitious Catholics on the one hand and the arbitrary and anarchical Puritans on the other. However, Prynne's thrusts were as yet only pricks for the time had not come for him to destroy bishops and prelates in general and one in particular. Now he found the folly that collected all the sins of the day: in 1633 the fatal and fateful thrust of the sword appeared in over a thousand pages showing that plays were unlawful and ungodly and incentives to every kind of immorality. Fatal, for this masterpiece, *Histriomastix*, roused Prynne to a fury of hate for Archbishop Laud which did not abate until Laud was in the Tower awaiting execution. Fateful, for this same masterpiece resulted in the elevation of Prynne to the dizzy heights of martyrdom. He warned kings that kings and emperors who had favored the drama had met violent deaths. He attacked women actors as notorious characters, when queens were taking part in masques.

⁵R. P. T. Coffin, *Laud*, p. 181.

⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 183, 188.

"Our English shorn and frizzled madams have lost all shame—so many steps in the dance, so many steps toward hell; dancing is the chief honor, plays the chief pleasure of the devil. Within two years four thousand plays have been sold, better printed and more sought after than Bibles and sermons. Those who attend the play-houses are no better than devils incarnate; at least like those who hunt, play at cards, wear wigs, visit fairs, etc., they are on the high road to damnation. And yet their number is so great that it is proposed to build a sixth chapel to the devil in London, whereas in Rome, in the time of Nero, there were only three."⁷ Without mentioning names Prynne said a good deal in this lengthy work of the evils existing at the court of Charles I, using all his eloquence in picturing the wrath of God on plays and play-goers, play actors, play music, play dancing. He damned them with quotations from the Scriptures, from the writings of the Church Fathers, and even from heathen philosophers. This was, indeed, his masterpiece.

Archbishop Laud decided it was time to stop this impertinent scribbler who criticized church sanctities and the Queen. Attorney-General Noy summoned William Prynne before the Star Chamber in 1634 on the charge of attacking the King and Queen. He was sentenced to pay a fine of £5000, to have his name removed from the rolls of Oxford and Lincoln's Inn, to have his book publicly burned, and to sit in the pillory with both ears cut off.⁸ As he had nothing with which to pay the fine, he was put in the Tower after the execution of the rest of the sentence. Burning with furious anger at Archbishop Laud who had taken occasion to censure him in the Star Chamber, Prynne now became his most virulent assailant. Tract after tract poured forth anonymously from the Tower. *The Looking Glass for all Lordly Prelates* in 1637 was almost a direct attack on the Archbishop; and growing bolder that same year Prynne hurled at him *A Breviate of the Prelate's Intolerable Usurpation upon the King's Royal and the Subject's Liberties*. The long titles thundered and growled ominously as this bold critic suddenly found that all the distressing sins of Stuart England were the work of this arch officer of the devil. The crowds in the streets were reading handbills to the effect that the Arch-Wolf of Canterbury was persecuting saints and spilling the blood of martyrs. The inarticulate millions were beginning to find their voice when Prynne was again summoned before the Star Chamber for his scurrilous attack on episcopacy in *News from Ipswich*. Once more he was sentenced to a fine, a longer stay in the pillory with the stumps of his ears cut off, and S. L.—seditious

⁷Quoted in *Historians History of the World* (H. S. Williams ed.) Vol. 19, 571.

⁸William Laud, *Works*, VI, i, 234 (Bliss ed., 1853).

libeller—branded on his cheek.⁹ He bore with defiant courage the barbarity of the executioner and this time had no reason to complain of the want of popular sympathy. Once before he had bled unpitied in the pillory but now after three years the crowd applauded and scattered flowers in the path of the martyred leader as he went back to prison. "In a letter to Strafford Laud declares that it was a scandal to the nation to see how Prynne had been allowed to talk while standing with his clipped head locked in his wooden collar and how he had received acclamation from the people and how notes of what he had said had been taken down and spread in written copies through the city."¹⁰ He was placed in close confinement away from his friendly audience, first at Carnavon Castle and later on the Isle of Jersey where he was fired with a single purpose, the annihilation of his enemy.

While incarcerated there, Prynne wrote much verse. He was no more a poet than he was a true Puritan but with the landscape of Jersey he could illustrate great moral lessons.

"O let this castle on a rock insure
Our souls to build on Christ, a rock most sure,
A castle, fortress, bulwark, hold, and tower
Above the reach of foes or human power,
And let the mount up which we daily climb
Advance our thoughts to objects more sublime!"¹¹

A Christian Sea-Card for the governor's daughter :

"The sea's the way, means, pass to transport
Men to those ports to which they would resort.
Christ's blood's the sea, way, ship which men convoys
From earth to heaven and eternal joys."

indicates no kinship of his verses with those amorous ditties he condemned in the plays. His fondness for rows of adjectives and rows of nouns piled one on top of the other is as evident in his poetry as in his analysis of the drama or his peroration on curls, but the man's sincerity is equally evident. He was honest and, though in a narrow sense, a thorough patriot.

In the meantime the King and Archbishop were having grave difficulties. There was active resistance in Scotland, people were goaded to frenzy in Ireland and discontent was rife in England. In despair Charles I convened Parliament in 1640. Absolutism had been tried and found wanting, and the reforming zeal was strong, for men like Pym and Hampden had not forgotten earlier experiences. The doors

⁹*Ibid.*, I, 35.

¹⁰Coffin, *Laud*, p. 201.

¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 203, 205.

of the prison were opened and William Prynne made a triumphal entry into London, the most popular man in England. The gates of the Tower closed on Archbishop Laud, the most hated man in England. The Commons declared the two sentences against Prynne illegal, restored his degrees, and voted a money reparation.¹² His marks of martyrdom made him a living lesson of the consequential acts of a tyrannical government. London was more than ever the workshop of the impending revolution and especially after the angry Commons had taken their way down the river from Westminster to the City to avoid further intrusions from a tragically unwise King. Londoners walked about in an atmosphere charged with electricity, and Prynne walked about like a flame descending on Sodom and Gomorrah.

With the outbreak of war, Prynne took up his pen in defense of *The Sovereign Power of Parliaments and Kingdoms*. Citing numerous historical precedents, he proved with his usual vehemence and repetition that Parliament was the lawful ruler of the realm. In *A Sovereign Antidote* he had found the medicine that would cure the nation of all its ills. Subjects had the right in Commons to rule and, furthermore, the *Vindication of Psalm 105, ver. 15* proved it was the duty of subjects to take up arms to preserve this right. But his main energy, the great task to which he now devoted himself, his *magnum opus*, was the prosecution of Archbishop Laud. The Archbishop had been in the Tower for three years and was almost forgotten in the wild fanaticism that accompanied the Civil War. But intolerance increased, and the accumulated bitterness and hatred manifested itself most violently against Laud. William Prynne's vindictive spirit, his personal animosity, directed the collection and arranging of evidence which he manipulated to suit his purpose. He assisted the prosecution in every way, even bearing testimony himself in support of some of the charges; he hunted up witnesses and instructed them in the right sort of material to use. "The Archbishop is a stranger to me, but Mr. Prynne's tampering about the witnesses is so palpable and foul that I cannot but pity him and cry shame of it,"¹³ commented a barrister at the trial. Manipulating and tampering were not all that this active accuser did, for now he was intrusted with the congenial task of searching Laud's rooms both at Lambeth and at the Tower.¹⁴ The result of this vigilant industry was his editing of Laud's diary, *A Breviate of the Life of William Laud*, a garbled and most efficiently and effectively expurgated edition.¹⁵ On March 12, 1644, began the trial to which William Prynne

¹²*Commons Journal*, 11, 24, 123, 366.

¹³Laud, *Works*, IV, 51.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, IV, 25.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, III, 259.

had dedicated his life. It was a unique case, for the dreams Laud had recorded in his diary were to be used as evidence against him. "The last (omen) is his own fatal dream at Oxford, long since published and lately attested from his own mouth at his trial in the Lord's House, the sum whereof is this: that when he was a young scholar in Oxford he dreamed one night that he came to far greater preferment in the church and power in the state than ever any other man of his birth and calling did before him; in which greatness and worldly happiness he continued for many years; but after all this happiness, before he waked, he dreamed he was hanged. The first part of this dream hath been long since really verified, and the conclusion of it is in all probability like to be speedily accomplished upon the close of his trial,"¹⁶ prophesied Prynne with evident satisfaction. The execution of Laud completed Prynne's real life work.

During the last days of the Civil War William Prynne seems to have lost none of his energy and vehemence, though many of his causes had become successful. His heart could still burn with impassioned zeal, he could still hate violently. He could still write pamphlets whose titles were Jovian thunderbolts hurled at an offending Wrong. He found that he hated Presbyterianism as much as he had formerly hated Episcopacy, and denounced with his usual vociferousness any kind of individual freedom of religion. The State was supreme over the Church, for the new independent rationalists found no place in his *Independency Examined, Unmasked, and Refuted*. He likewise found that he hated the Army and established a *Full Vindication and Answer of the Eleven Accused Members*, though they were Presbyterians. As a member of Parliament in 1648 he continued his denunciation of it, and in spite of earlier pamphlets to the contrary he took part against those who called for the execution of the King.¹⁷ For this he was again figuratively pilloried by being included in Pride's Purge and his active resistance sent him back to his familiar haunts in prison for three years. The execution of a king, one who died so much better than he had lived, made him a martyr to the tyranny of Parliament much as Prynne had played that same rôle of martyr to the tyranny of a King. Prynne found, also, that he hated Parliament. The vindication of this; the discovery of that; the unmasking of one evil; the declaration of another did not regain for him his earlier popularity, though tracts with devastating titles continued to flow from his prolific pen. Said Wood, his biographer, "I verily believe, if rightly computed, he wrote a sheet

¹⁶Coffin, *Laud*, p. 39.

¹⁷Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, IV, 264, 267.

for every day of his life, reckoning from the time he came to the use of reason and the state of man."¹⁸

For a brief time in 1659 he again took his part as leading character speaking all the best lines. The position of the "secluded members" by Pride's Purge gave him his chance to write more tracts. Prynne and his fellow-outcasts endeavored to take their seats in the House which immediately adjourned.¹⁹ Wrathfully and with indomitable courage Prynne attacked his opponents and for many months wrote indefatigably exposing the tyranny of the House.²⁰ Popular acclaim put him on the crest of the wave again and in 1660 he led the ejected members triumphantly into the House amid the cheers of the spectators. He now had the wholly satisfying task of erasing the votes against those excluded by Pride's Purge. He also had the equally pleasant task of bringing to an end the quarrelsome Long Parliament.²¹ All his earlier vehemence and boldness returned in unabated force as he asserted the right of a Stuart to the throne, and his bitterness and vindictiveness were also unabated as he demanded that the regicides be indiscriminately punished.²² In 1661 Prynne was almost a martyr again when his pamphlet against a state church was voted seditious and only his abject submission saved him from another imprisonment.²³ But as a leader of the temperamental populace these last years were all a mistake. His glorious period was in the attack he made on Church and King before the Civil War and everything after his triumphal entry in London in 1640 was an anti-climax. The Restoration left him no real grievances to air. The old warrior could not decide which was the unpopular cause to make into a battle cry against the oppressor.

Shortly after the Restoration Prynne was made Keeper of the Records in the Tower. He took up his work there transcribing and arranging the records, leaving as lengthy a record of achievement during his tenure of office as he had as a pamphleteer. His published books and pamphlets, over two hundred of them, occupy about twenty-four columns in the catalogue of the British Museum. It was during these years that he did his most valuable and permanent work. As a writer his style has no merits, the arrangement of his materials is careless, but the achievement is a lasting monument to his memory. The number of historical documents and the collections of records are a veritable treasure house for the historian, for they possess lasting value, as an enormous number of them were printed for

¹⁸Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*, III, 852.

¹⁹*Old Parliamentary History*, XXI, 384.

²⁰Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*, III, 853.

²¹*Commons Journal*, VII, 847, 848, 852.

²²*Old Parliamentary History*, XXII, 339, 352.

²³*Commons Journal*, VII, 301.

the first time. The last years of William Prynne were thus filled with the kind of work he liked for he had always been interested in antiquities. According to Aubrey, "his manner of study was thus: he wore a long quilt cap, which came two or three inches at least over his eyes, which served him as an umbrella to defend his eyes from light; About every three hours his man was to bring him a roll and a pot of ale to refocillate his wasted spirits; so he studied and drank, and munched his bread; and this maintained him until night, and then he made a good supper."²⁴ Prynne died in 1669 "in his lodgings in Lincoln's Inn, and was buried in the walk under the chapel there, which stands upon pillars."²⁵

This erstwhile resident in prison mutilated in the pillory; the darling of the London mob; the defender of Parliaments; the assailer of Parliaments; the accuser of the King; the champion of the King; the denouncer of Presbyterianism and the Army; the upholder of both; the exterminator of Laud; the angel of the wrath of God ended as Keeper of the Records in the Tower, and died respected, quiet, and forgotten.

²⁴John Aubrey, *Letters from the Bodleian Library*, II, 508.

²⁵Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*, III, 876.

SOME OBSERVATIONS OF TRAVELERS ON SOUTH CAROLINA,
1820-1860

J. RION McKISSICK

University of South Carolina

Allan Nevins points out that "every American has heard much of the best-known books of British travel in the United States; yet few except special students of our history know what a rich panorama of narrative and description they unfold."¹

The greater number of the travelers who have visited us have been Englishmen and Northerners, although there has been a respectable representation from other sections and countries. Some tarried but a few days; others remained longer to get more first-hand information. Some came with immovable preconceptions and prejudices, but others were of open, impartial mind, in quest of truth.

Lieut. Francis Hall of the British army, who visited Charleston in 1818, like virtually every traveler who went there in the first half of the last century, was impressed with what he heard about the unhealthfulness of the region. Inquiring the reason for the unusually large number of churches in the metropolis, he was informed that "this devotional access came on about the period of the French Revolution, in consequence of every severe alarm at the danger to which religion, and social order were exposed."²

William Faux, who spent many days in South Carolina in 1819, is described by Nevins as "of jaundiced eye and malicious tongue . . . an English farmer, so credulous, coarse, and illnatured as to excite the ridicule of the very magazines whose prejudice against the republic equalled his own."³

Just after Faux arrived in Charleston, President Monroe was the city's guest. The Englishman related that a wagoner, who was ordered by the military to move out of the road when the presidential party approached the city, replied: "Pray . . . by what authority do you stop me? It is more than the president dare do. Shew me your authority. If you had civilly asked me, I would have driven into the ditch to obleege you."⁴

What particularly horrified Faux in South Carolina was the physical violence of which he heard on every hand. A friend told him that he had lately met at the Planters' Hotel a party of 13 gentlemen,

¹Allan Nevins, *American Social History as Recorded by British Travelers* (1923), p. 111.

²Francis Hall, *Travels in Canada and the U. S. in 1817 and 1818* (1818), p. 412.

³Allen Nevins, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 18.

⁴W. Faux, *Memorable Days in America*, (1823), p. 45.

11 of whom had each killed his man in a duel.⁵ In a letter published in the *Charleston Courier* he asserted that, when he was about twenty miles from Columbia, he encountered a number of citizens exhuming the body of a slave. His master and three others had seized him and tied him to a tree, and each in turn had wantonly whipped him from midnight until sunrise, when he died. Faux further charged that he was told that, when the negro fainted, his tormentors threw cold water on his face, and poured whiskey down his throat, all "to prolong the sport." This letter, when published, stirred angry discussion. Governor Geddes asked the Englishman to make an affidavit concerning the outrage to Robert Y. Hayne, attorney general. Escorted by one of the governor's aides, Faux went to discuss the case with Hayne, who told him that such instances were rare in South Carolina and that the State always promptly punished those guilty of such atrocities. Faux declared that Hayne informed him that he would have Kelly, the slave's master, indicted, but, the traveler contended, there was no evidence that the attorney general redeemed his promise.⁶ After publication of his letter, he said, his friends cautioned him against being out late in the evening, telling him: "Take care of yourself, for dirking is the fashion."⁷

Adam Hodgson, a Liverpool gentleman who visited South Carolina in 1820, vigorously condemned slavery, but praised some of our people. Writing from Charleston, he declared that "the best society here, though not very extensive, is much superior to any which I have yet seen in America."⁸ Later he added: "The highest class of Carolinians are, I am told, and my observation hitherto confirms the remark, men of good breeding and liberal education. They assume a superiority in these respects, over even the Virginians, and it appears to be generally conceded to them."⁹ In one plantation house he found "a more extensive collection of English agricultural works than I ever saw in a private library before."¹⁰ Hodgson's book was dedicated to the memory of his admired friend, William Lowndes.¹¹

A. Levasseur was one of LaFayette's traveling companions on his last visit in 1825 and author of a journal of the tour. He said that he had written of the Jews only in South Carolina, "because they are found in no other State in sufficient numbers to make them remarkable." In South Carolina were about 1200, of whom 500 were in

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁸Adam Hodgson, *Letters from North America* (1824), I, 48.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 65.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 48.

¹¹*Ibid.*

Charleston, as against hardly 5,000 for the rest of the United States, he said.¹²

Capt. Basil Hall, who had retired from the English navy after service including the period of the Napoleonic Wars, came to South Carolina in 1829. His picture of what he found here was tolerant and kindly. Inspection of the South Carolina College moved him to observe: "I heard the same complaint here as in most other parts of the Union, that there was the greatest difficulty in persuading the young men to remain long enough in training, to acquire an adequate amount of classical knowledge. . . . The high stimulus to early marriages, held out by the facility of providing for a family, and the enterprising, uncontrollable spirit of the Southern planters in particular, come sorely in the way of those patient studies, those nights and days of laborious application, by which alone scholars or mathematicians can be formed."¹³

Of all the travelers here quoted, Hall is mildest with reference to reports of cruelty to slaves: "I have much satisfaction . . . in stating, that after many careful enquiries, I have no reason to suppose unnecessary severity is by any means general in America."¹⁴

Much darker was the picture drawn in 1830 by James Stuart, a Scotchman who at one time edited the *London Courier*. As he was traveling through the Pee Dee section, he said, a wealthy planter told him that another planter in the neighborhood, when he thought it necessary to discipline his slaves severely, was in the habit of putting them into coffins, which were partly nailed down, and that this had again and again resulted in deaths. He could not be prosecuted, because the only witnesses were slaves, whose testimony would be inadmissible against him.¹⁵

C. D. Arfwedson, an English visitor in 1832, like almost every other traveler, commented on the difficulties and dangers of transportation. As he passed through the swamps on his way to Marion, "the coach was continually in water, which rose in many places above the axletrees, threatening more than once to invade the coach itself. Nothing is more common, after heavy rains, than for the water to penetrate into the carriage; and passengers, to avoid drowning, are then obliged to have recourse to the roof."¹⁶

Harriett Martineau, English writer and publicist, in Charleston called on a woman who, she said, was treated as if she were "a main pillar of the nullification party." Hanging in her home was the

¹²A. Levasseur, *LaFayette in America* (1829), II, 62.

¹³Basil Hall, *Travels in North America* (1830), III, 133, 134.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 194.

¹⁵James Stuart, *Three Years in North America* (1833), II, 119.

¹⁶C. D. Arfwedson, *The United States and Canada in 1832, 1833 and 1834* (1834), pp. 368, 369.

portrait of a man, the top of his head and his dress visible, but the face obliterated or covered over. Upon inquiry by the English woman, the Charlestonian was "only too ready to explain" that it was a likeness of President Jackson which she had hung up in the days when he enjoyed her favor, but since Nullification she had veiled his face to show "how she hated him."¹⁷

G. W. Featherstonhaugh, an English geologist, tarried long enough in Columbia in 1835 to call on Dr. Thomas Cooper, then about 80. When the visitor congratulated him upon the adoption of the Compromise Act which had ended the Nullification movement, the doctor "rose from his easy chair, and although almost bent double like a hook, he seized the hearth-brush, and with his eyes full of fire, and wielding the brush as if it were a broadsword, denounced the Compromise Act as an ignoble measure which he never could approve of; declared that the Nullifiers were quite in the wrong to make peace with the Union men . . . and that it would have been a much better course for them to have taken the field against General Jackson, and have fought all the power he could have brought against them. 'We have lost a fine opportunity, sir, of carrying this State to the highest renown,' said this little crooked octogenarian; and then giving General Jackson a desperate cut with the hearth-brush, he went back to his easy chair again."¹⁸

The Hon. Charles Augustus Murray, an accomplished gentleman of the British court, had a hurried look at Charleston in 1835. His most interesting comment was: "There is something warm, frank, and courteous in the manner of a real Carolinian; he is not studiously, but naturally polite; and though his character may not be remarkable for that persevering industry and close attention to minutiae in business, which are so remarkable in the New England merchants, he is far from deficient in sagacity, courage, or enterprise. Altogether, with due allowance for exceptions, I should say that the Carolinian character is more kin to that of England; the New England, to that of the lowland Scotch."¹⁹

The only traveler in the group here treated who visited the Piedmont section of South Carolina was James Silk Buckingham, an all-round reformer, ex-member of Parliament, and founder of the Athenaeum. Slavery profoundly affected the training and education of white youth, Buckingham held. Wealthy South Carolina families formerly sent their sons to Brown and Harvard, but the practice had decreased. Young men were educated in Charleston and Colum-

¹⁷Harriett Martineau, *Retrospect of Western Travel* (1838), I, 238, 239.

¹⁸G. W. Featherstonhaugh, *Excursion Through the Slave States* (1844), p. 157.

¹⁹Charles Augustus Murray, *Travels in North America* (1839), p. 276.

bia, the reason assigned being "that the students returning from the north so often came home 'tainted with abolitionism' . . . and with such 'a distaste for their domestic institutions' . . . that it was thought dangerous to the welfare of the country any longer to continue the practice."²⁰

This commentator, the only one of the group who devoted much attention to education in the State, asserted that many students did not enter the South Carolina College until they were 21, and that few left until they were 23 or 24. One of the characteristic differences between the North and the South was the early period at which youths of the former quit education for active business. The reason for this was that in the North almost every young man was destined to be a merchant or a professional man, or to pursue some active walk in life. In the South the greater number of young men who received college education were sons of planters, who were not brought up to any business and who expected to become planters themselves. Buckingham added the assertion that most of the Southern students remained in college until they were near their middle twenties, and often went to Europe on a tour for two or three years afterwards. "This sufficiently explains," said Buckingham, "why the gentlemen of the South are in general so much more thoroughly educated in the classics and polite literature, and so much more polished in their manners, than those of the North."²¹

A Georgia woman, who raised silkworms and wove silk cloth, told Buckingham that she could sell to South Carolinians as much as she could weave at double the price of French and English silks. Her explanation was: "The people of South Carolina were all for living on their own resources, and having no dependence on other countries; they, therefore, readily paid double prices for silks grown and manufactured at home, because it shut out the foreign trader, and kept all the money in the country."²²

Of the politics of the Piedmont section, Buckingham recorded: "Nearly all the planters and farmers of the interior are of the Democratic party in politics, that is, in opposition to the Federalists, Conservatives, or Whigs. The chief reason of this seems to be that they have not been so hampered in their operations of business, as the merchants of the cities have been by General Jackson's and Mr. Van Buren's measures respecting the currency, but have profited by the high prices of farming-produces, while bankruptcy and distress have been very general among the merchants; so that each class supports

²⁰J. S. Buckingham, *The Slave States of America* (1842), I, 54.

²¹*Ibid.*, pp. 23, 24.

²²*Ibid.*, pp. 163, 164.

that party in politics whose measures they think most conducive to the promotion of their pecuniary interests."²³

Sir Charles Lyell, famous English geologist, who visited South Carolina in 1842, saw very little evidence of maltreatment of slaves and much evidence that they were treated well. He pronounced the South Carolina Railroad from Charleston to Augusta "excellent," adding: "As we scarcely saw by the way any town or village, or even a clearing, nor any human habitation except the station houses, the spirit of enterprise displayed in such public works filled me with astonishment which increased the farther I went South."²⁴

Frederika Bremer, Swedish woman of letters, found South Carolina charming in 1850 in all but one respect—slavery. "I scarcely ever met with a man, or woman either who can openly and honestly look the thing in the face."²⁵ The right thing about slavery would be done by the South, Miss Bremer believed, if the women would but awake. "But ah! the greater number here sleep still—sleep on soft couches, fanned by their slaves, not as free women. . . . It is now time that she should listen . . . to the voice of God's spirit in the human race, which sounds over the whole earth, and vibrates through all free nations."²⁶ After beholding Calhoun's funeral procession in Charleston, the Swedish author described him as "the fascinating man in society, the excellent head of a family, with manners as pure as those of a woman, affectionate to all his relatives, a good master, almost adored by his servants and slaves—in a word, the amiable human being which even his enemies acknowledge him to have been."²⁷ Further, she remarked, "in South Carolina, the idolatry with which he was regarded was carried to the extreme, and it has been said, in joke, that 'when Calhoun took snuff, the whole of Carolina sneezed.' Even now people talk and write about him as if he had been a divine person."²⁸

James Sterling, a highly educated Scotchman who was here in 1857, noted that the most trustworthy opinions he could get agreed in estimating one free laborer as at least equal to two slaves.²⁹ The situation then with reference to railway passenger traffic resembled that today: "On the Southern railways one has generally abundance of room. . . . A traveler told me, he was the sole passenger on a night train between Charlotte and Columbia. Here the passenger trade is almost solely the through traffic from one considerable town

²³*Ibid.*, pp. 23, 24.

²⁴Charles Lyell, *Travel in North America* (1849), I, 154.

²⁵Frederika Bremer, *The Homes of the New World* (1853), I, 275.

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 387.

²⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 304, 305.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 305.

²⁹James Sterling, *Letters from the Slave States*, (1857), pp. 231, 232.

to another, and these are often at great distance from each other." A director of the Georgian Central Railway told Sterling that passenger traffic constituted only 17 per cent of its total business.³⁰

Extreme abolitionist was J. Benwell, an Englishman who visited South Carolina probably about 1857. Because of his interest in a proposed school for negroes in Charleston,³¹ he was warned by his landlord that he was being watched.³² After dining privately and riding with a "free negro gentleman,"³³ he was apprehensive of trouble, but met none.

Charles Mackay, once editor of the *London Illustrated News*, viewed South Carolina briefly in 1858. He found that the slave-owners, as a body, were not cruel; that many treated their slaves with patriarchal and paternal kindness; but that they were blinded by education and habits, as well as supposed self-interest, to the real evils of a system "the horrors of which they do their best to alleviate."³⁴ However, he concluded: "Measured by mere physical enjoyment, and absence of care or thought of the morrow, the slave is, doubtless, as a general rule, far happier than his master. His wants are few, he is easily satisfied, and his toil is not excessive."³⁵

Only one of the company of Northerners and Westerners who saw South Carolina in the period and published their observations can be quoted. John S. C. Abbott, New England minister and author, here in 1860, wrote that there was then a general impression north of Mason and Dixon's Line, that the whole South was in a blaze of fury against the people of the non-slaveholding states. In view of this, he thought his own observations worthy of record: "I did not meet one single individual who advocated disunion. For aught I know, there may have been thousands in that region in favor of disunion whom I did not meet; but I did not converse with a single one who advocated such views. On the contrary, I met many who spoke in tones of sadness of the bitterness of the strife, and who deplored the idea of any separation between the North and the South. As I perused the fierce denunciations in Congress, I was often led to inquire: 'Where do these fiery spirits come from and whom do they represent?'"³⁶

Nevins declares that "a considerable degree of unity is discernible in the whole mass of British writings on America, and from these hundreds of volumes it is possible to obtain a composite portrait with

³⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 264, 265.

³¹J. Benwell, *An Englishman's Travels in America* (n.d.) p. 195.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 197.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 199.

³⁴Charles Mackay, *Life and Liberty in America* (1837), p. 199.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 205.

³⁶John S. C. Abbott, *South and North*, pp. 206, 207.

strongly marked lineaments. It is upon the external features of American life, of course, that the agreement is most emphatic."³⁷

From similar sources could be drawn a likeness of South Carolina which, whatever blemishes it might disclose, would abound in color, interest, and enlightenment. No dull, prosaic task will be his who some day undertakes a social history of the Palmetto State as recorded by the travelers who have enabled us to see ourselves as others have seen us.

³⁷Allan Nevins, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

ACOMB, FRANCES D.....	Rock Hill, S. C.
<i>Instructor in History, Winthrop College</i>	
ALDREDGE, R. C.....	Charleston, S. C.
<i>U. S. Weather Bureau</i>	
✓ANDERSON, REBECCA.....	Greenwood, S. C.
<i>Greenwood High School</i>	
ANDERSON, J. PERRIN.....	Greenville, S. C.
<i>Greenville High School</i>	
BAKER, MARY NEEL.....	Greenwood, S. C.
<i>Greenwood High School</i>	
✓BEAUDROT, MARY.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>University of South Carolina</i>	
BENNETT, MRS. JOHN.....	Charleston, S. C.
BLAKE, E. H.....	Greenwood, S. C.
BLUME, VERA.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Columbia High School</i>	
BONN, E. T.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Associate Professor of History, University of South Carolina</i>	
BOYD, RUTH.....	Newberry, S. C.
<i>Newberry High School</i>	
BROWN, MARSHALL W.....	Clinton, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, Presbyterian College</i>	
✓BRUCE, AGNES.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>University of South Carolina</i>	
(2) CALLCOTT, W. H.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, University of South Carolina</i>	
CALHOUN, ARTHUR W.....	Gaffney, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, Limestone College</i>	
CAUTHEN, CHARLES E.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, Columbia College</i>	
CHASE, MRS. MELVIN.....	Greenville, S. C.
<i>Librarian, Greenville Public Library</i>	
CHILDS, MRS. ARNEY R.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Principal, Logan School</i>	
CHILDS, ST. JULIEN R.....	Charleston, S. C.
<i>Assistant Professor of History, The Citadel</i>	
CLAYTON, CHRISTINE.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Columbia High School</i>	
COLEMAN, JAMES K.....	Charleston, S. C.
<i>Associate Professor of History, The Citadel</i>	
CRANE, THOMAS E.....	Allendale, S. C.
<i>The Macmillan Company</i>	
DANIEL, LUCIA.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>University High School</i>	
DAVIS, H. C.....	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Professor of English, University of South Carolina</i>	
DENMARK, EMMA C.....	Greenville, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, Greenville Woman's College</i>	

- DICKSON, GEORGE L.....Greenwood, S. C.
Headmaster, Bailey Military Institute
- EASTERBY, J. H.....Charleston, S. C.
Professor of History, College of Charleston
- EASTERBY, MATTIE.....Charleston, S. C.
Charleston Public Schools
- EPTING, CARL L. JR.....Spartanburg, S. C.
Acting Associate Professor of History, Wofford College
- FAIR, HENRY W.....Columbia, S. C.
American Book Company
- FERRELL, C. M.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of History, University of South Carolina
- FLIPPIN, PERCY SCOTT.....Hartsville, S. C.
Professor of History, Coker College
- FOGARTY, SIMON.....Charleston, S. C.
Principal, Crafts School
- ✓FULLER, LEONIDE.....Columbia, S. C.
University of South Carolina
- GILPATRICK, D. H.....Greenville, S. C.
Professor of History, Furman University
- ✓GREGORIE, ANNE KING.....Montevallo, Ala.
Assistant Professor of History, Alabama College
- GREEN, EDWIN L.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of Ancient Languages, University of South Carolina
- GRIFFIN, CHARLES.....Columbia, S. C.
University of South Carolina
- ✓HOLLIS, L. P.....Greenville, S. C.
Superintendent, Parkor District Schools
- HOLMES, A. G.....Clemson College, S. C.
Professor of History, Clemson College
- HOWARD, LAURA E.....Hartsville, S. C.
Professor of History, Coker College
- HURD, A. M.....Rock Hill, S. C.
Rock Hill High School
- JOHNSON, MRS. T. P.....Newberry, S. C.
Newberry City Schools
- JONES, F. DUDLEY.....Clinton, S. C.
Professor of Psychology and Philosophy, Presbyterian College
- KEITH, WARREN G.....Rock Hill, S. C.
Professor of History, Winthrop College
- KIBLER, LILLIAN.....Newberry, S. C.
Newberry High School
- KILPATRICK, EMMETT.....Columbia, S. C.
Associate Professor of Romance Languages, University of South Carolina
- LESESNE, J. M.....Columbia, S. C.
University of South Carolina
- ✓LEVETT, ELLA P.....Charleston, S. C.
North Charleston High School
- ✓MACAULAY, GWYNN ALLAN.....Columbia, S. C.
University of South Carolina
- MAGILL, SADIE.....Columbia, S. C.
Columbia High School

- MERIWETHER, R. L.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of History, University of South Carolina
- MILLS, W. H.....Clemson College, S. C.
Professor of Rural Sociology, Clemson College
- MCCAIN, JOHN WALKER, JR.....Rock Hill, S. C.
Professor of English, Winthrop College
- MCINTOSH, NANCY.....Columbia, S. C.
University of South Carolina
- McKISSICK, J. RION.....Columbia, S. C.
Professor of Journalism, University of South Carolina
- NORTON, C. C.....Spartanburg, S. C.
Professor of Government and Sociology, Wofford College
- OLIPHANT, MRS. A. D.....Greenville, S. C.
- PATTON, J. W.....Spartanburg, S. C.
Professor of History, Converse College
- PEARLSTINE, HANNA.....Columbia, S. C.
Columbia High School
- PRINCE, HELEN L.....Landrum, S. C.
Landrum High School
- ROBINSON, MRS. LINA G.....Florence, S. C.
Florence Junior High School
- RUGHEIMER, NATALIE.....Charleston, S. C.
Memminger High School
- SALLEY, A. S.....Columbia, S. C.
Secretary of the Historical Commission of South Carolina
- SHAFFER, E. T. H.....Walterboro, S. C.
- SHERRILL, G. R.....Clemson College, S. C.
Associate Professor of History and Economics, Clemson College
- ✓ SINGLETON, KATHLEEN.....Columbia, S. C.
University of South Carolina
- SPIGNER, E. T.....Columbia, S. C.
Ginn and Company
- ✓ SUTCLIFF, S. C.....Gaffney, S. C.
Limestone College
- TAYLOR, JOHN STUART.....Greenville, S. C.
President, Upper South Carolina Historical Society
- TAYLOR, MARY.....Charleston, S. C.
Memminger High School
- TAYLOR, ROSSER H.....Greenville, S. C.
Professor of History, Furman University
- WALLACE, D. D.....Spartanburg, S. C.
Professor of History, Wofford College
- WEBBER, MABEL L.....Charleston, S. C.
Secretary, South Carolina Historical Society
- WHITE, FANNIE BELL.....Columbia, S. C.
Columbia High School
- WIENEFELD, R. H.....Columbia, S. C.
Associate Professor of History, University of South Carolina
- WILLIAMS, ANNIE GAINES.....Greenwood, S. C.
Professor of History, Lander College
- WILLIAMS, S. J.....Charleston, S. C.
Professor of History, The Citadel
- ✓ WOLFE, J. H.....Columbia, S. C.
University of South Carolina

NEARLY A CENTURY OF ACHIEVEMENT IN SERVICE AND QUALITY



THE R. L. BRYAN COMPANY

*Printing, Binding, Ruling, Engraving
and Steel Die Embossing*

OFFICE FURNITURE
AND SUPPLIES

The Best in Books

DeLuxe Stationery, Fountain Pens, Automatic Pencils

Kodaks and Films, Inks, Pads, Desk Sets

Brief Cases, Leather Writing Cases

Beautiful Imported and Domestic Gift Novelties, Pottery

Birthday and Friendship Cards

1440 MAIN STREET

COLUMBIA, S. C.

OUR BOOK STORE IS ONE OF THE OLDEST IN THE SOUTH

